Ex Libris

Ronald E. Gallagher

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/grammarofnewtest0000unse_a6h8

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

Prof. J. H. MOULTON, D.D.
and
Prof. W. F. HOWARD, D.D.

Volume I.—PROLEGOMENA
Third Edition

Volume II.—ACCIDENCE AND WORD-FORMATION
Part I.—General Introduction.
Sounds and Writing
Part II.—Accidence
(*a*) Nouns; (*b*) Verbs and Lists
Part III.—Word-Formation
With Appendix on Semitisms and
Indexes to Vol. II.
Binding the three parts in Cloth
Complete Volume

Volume III.—SYNTAX *In preparation*

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

BY

JAMES HOPE MOULTON
M.A. (CANTAB.), D.LIT. (LOND.)
LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
GREENWOOD PROFESSOR OF HELLENISTIC GREEK AND INDO-EUROPEAN PHILOLOGY
IN THE VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
TUTOR IN NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
WESLEYAN COLLEGE, DIDSBURY

VOL. I

PROLEGOMENA

THIRD EDITION
WITH CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

EDINBURGH : T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

First Edition 1906
Second Edition 1906
Third Edition 1908
,, ,, *Reprinted* 1919
,, ,, ,, ... 1930
,, ,, ,, ... 1949
,, ,, ,, ... 1957

IN PIAM MEMORIAM
PATRIS
LABORVM HERES DEDICO

PREFACE.

The call for a second edition of this work within six or seven months of its first appearance gives me a welcome opportunity of making a good many corrections and additions, without altering in any way its general plan. Of the scope of these new features I shall have something to say later; at this point I have to explain the title-page, from which certain words have disappeared, not without great reluctance on my part. The statement in the first edition that the book was "based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar," claimed for it connexion with a work which for thirty-five years had been in constant use among New Testament students in this country and elsewhere. I should hardly have yielded this statement for excision, had not the suggestion come from one whose motives for retaining it are only less strong than my own. Sir John Clark, whose kindness throughout the progress of this work it is a special pleasure to acknowledge on such an opportunity, advised me that misapprehension was frequently occurring with those whose knowledge of this book was limited to the title. Since the present volume is entirely new, and does not in any way follow the lines of its great predecessor, it seems better to confine the history of the undertaking to the Preface, and take sole responsibility. I have unhappily no means of divining what judgement either Winer or his editor would have passed on my doctrines; and it is therefore, perhaps, due to *Pietät* that I should drop what *Pietät* mainly prompted.

It is now forty years since my father, to whose memory this book is dedicated, was invited by Messrs T. & T. Clark to translate and edit G. B. Winer's epoch-making *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms.* The proposal originated with Bishop Ellicott, afterwards Chairman of the New Testament Revision Company, and the last survivor of a band of workers who, while the following pages were in the press, became united once more. Dr Ellicott had been in correspondence on biblical matters with the young Assistant Tutor at the Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond; and his estimate of his powers was shown first by the proposal as to Winer, and not long after by the Bishop's large use of my father's advice in selecting new members of the Revision Company. Mr Moulton took his place in the Jerusalem Chamber in 1870, the youngest member of the Company; and in the same year his edition of Winer appeared. My brother's Life of our father (Isbister, 1899) gives an account of its reception. It would not be seemly for me to enlarge on its merits, and it would be as superfluous as unbecoming. I will only allow myself the satisfaction of quoting a few words from one who may well be called the greatest New Testament scholar this country has seen for generations. In giving his Cambridge students a short list of reference books, Dr Hort said (*Romans and Ephesians*, p. 71):—

> Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, as translated and enlarged by Dr Moulton, stands far above every other for this purpose. It does not need many minutes to learn the ready use of the admirable indices, of passages and of subjects: and when the book is consulted in this manner, its extremely useful contents become in most cases readily accessible. Dr Moulton's references to the notes of the best recent English commentaries are a helpful addition.

In 1875 Dr Moulton was transferred to Cambridge, charged by his Church with the heavy task of building up from the foundation a great Public School. What time a Head Master could spare to scholarship was for many years almost entirely pledged to the New Testament and Apocrypha Revision. Naturally it was not possible to do much to his Grammar when the second edition was called for in 1877. The third edition, five years later, was even less delayed for the incorporation of new matter; and the book stands now, in all essential points, just as it first came from its author's pen. Meanwhile the conviction was growing that the next edition must be a new book. Winer's own last edition, though far from antiquated, was growing decidedly old; its jubilee is in fact celebrated by its English descendant of to-day. The very thoroughness of Winer's work had made useless for the modern student many a disquisition against grammatical heresies which no one would now wish to drag from the lumber-room. The literature to which Winer appealed was largely buried in inaccessible foreign periodicals. And as the reputation of his editor grew, men asked for a more compact, better arranged, more up-to-date volume, in which the ripest and most modern work should no longer be stowed away in compressed notes at the foot of the page. Had time and strength permitted, Dr Moulton would have consulted his most cherished wish by returning to the work of his youth and rewriting his Grammar as an independent book. But "wisest Fate said No." He chose his junior colleague, to whom he had given, at first as his pupil, and afterwards during years of University training and colleagueship in teaching, an insight into his methods and principles, and at least an eager enthusiasm for the subject to which he had devoted his own life. But not a page of the new book was written when, in February 1898, "God's finger touched him, and he slept."

Since heredity does not suffice to make a grammarian, and there are many roads by which a student of New Testament language may come to his task, I must add a word to explain in what special directions this book may perhaps contribute to the understanding of the inexhaustible subject with which it deals. Till four years ago, my own teaching work scarcely touched the Greek Testament, classics and comparative philology claiming the major part of my time. But I have not felt that this time was ill spent as a preparation for the teaching of the New Testament. The study of the Science of Language in general, and especially in the field of the languages which are nearest of kin to Greek, is well adapted to provide points of view from which new light may be shed on the words of Scripture. Theologians, adepts in criticism, experts in early Christian literature, bring to a task like this an equipment to which I can make no pretence. But there are other studies, never more active than now, which may help the biblical student in unexpected ways. The life-history of the Greek language has been investigated with minutest care, not only in the age of its glory, but also throughout the centuries of its supposed senility and decay. Its syntax has been illuminated by the comparative method; and scholars have arisen who have been willing to desert the masterpieces of literature and trace the humble development of the Hellenistic vernacular down to its lineal descendant in the vulgar tongue of the present day. Biblical scholars cannot study everything, and there are some of them who have never heard of Brugmann and Thumb. It may be some service to introduce them to the side-lights which comparative philology can provide.

But I hope this book may bring to the exegete material yet more important for his purpose, which might not otherwise come his way. The immense stores of illustration which have been opened to us by the discoveries of Egyptian papyri, accessible to all on their lexical side in the brilliant *Bible Studies* of Deissmann, have not hitherto been systematically treated in their bearing on the grammar of New Testament Greek. The main purpose of these *Prolegomena* has accordingly been to provide a sketch of the language of the New Testament as it appears to those who have followed Deissmann into a new field of research. There are many matters of principle needing detailed discussion, and much new illustrative material from papyri and inscriptions, the presentation of which will, I hope, be found helpful and suggestive. In the present volume, therefore, I make no attempt at exhaustiveness, and often omit important subjects on which I have nothing new to say. By dint of much labour on the indices, I have tried to provide a partial remedy for the manifold inconveniences of form which the plan of these pages entails. My reviewers encourage me to hope that I have succeeded in one cherished ambition, that of writing a Grammar which can be read. The fascination of the Science of Language has possessed me ever since in boyhood I read Max Müller's incomparable *Lectures*; and I have made it my aim to communicate what I could of this fascination before going on to dry statistics and formulae. In the second volume I shall try to present as concisely as I can the systematic facts of Hellenistic accidence and syntax, not in the form of an appendix to a grammar of classical Greek, but giving the later language the independent dignity which it deserves. Both Winer himself and the other older scholars, whom a reviewer thinks I have unduly neglected, will naturally bulk more largely than they can do in chapters mainly intended to describe the most modern work. But the mere citation of authorities, in a handbook designed for practical utility, must naturally be subordinated to the succinct presentation of results. There will, I hope, be small danger of my readers' overlooking my indebtedness to earlier workers, and least of all that to my primary teacher, whose labours it is my supreme object to preserve for the benefit of a new generation.

It remains to perform the pleasant duty of acknowledging varied help which has contributed a large proportion of anything that may be true or useful in this book. It would be endless were I to name teachers, colleagues, and friends in Cambridge, to whom through twenty years' residence I contracted debts of those manifold and intangible kinds which can only be summarised in the most inadequate way: no Cantab who has lived as long within that home of exact science and sincere research, will fail to understand what I fail to express. Next to the Cambridge influences are those which come from teachers and friends whom I have never seen, and especially those great German scholars whose labours, too little assisted by those of other countries, have established the Science of Language on the firm basis it occupies to-day. In fields where British scholarship is more on a level with that of Germany, especially those of biblical exegesis and of Greek classical lore, I have also done my best to learn what fellow-workers east of the Rhine contribute to the common stock. It is to a German professor, working upon the material of which our own Drs Grenfell and Hunt have provided so large a proportion, that I owe the impulse which has produced the chief novelty of my work. My appreciation of the memorable achievement of Dr Deissmann is expressed in the body of the book; and I must only add here my grateful acknowledgement of the many encouragements he has given me in my efforts to glean after him in the field he has made his own. He has now crowned them with the all too generous appreciations of my work which he has contributed to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and the *Theologische Rundschau.* Another great name figures on most of the pages of this book. The services that Professor Blass has rendered to New Testament study are already almost equal to those he has rendered to classical scholarship. I have been frequently obliged to record a difference of opinion, though never without the inward voice whispering "*impar congressus Achilli.*" But the freshness of view which this great Hellenist brings to the subject makes him almost as helpful when he fails to convince as when he succeeds; and I have learned more and more from him, the more earnestly I have studied for myself. The name of another brilliant writer on New Testament Grammar, Professor Schmiedel, will figure more constantly in my second volume than my plan allows it to do in this.

The mention of the books which have been most frequently used, recalls the need of one or two explanations before closing this Preface. The text which is assumed throughout is naturally that of Westcott and Hort. The principles on which it is based, and the minute accuracy with which they are followed out, seem to allow no alternative to a grammatical worker, even if the B type of text were held to be only the result of second century revision. But in frequently quoting other readings, and especially those which belong to what Dr Kenyon conveniently calls the δ-text, I follow very readily the precedent of Blass. I need not say that Mr Geden's Concordance has been in continual use. I have not felt bound to enter much into questions of "higher criticism." In the case of the Synoptic Gospels, the assumption of the "two-source hypothesis" has suggested a number of grammatical points of interest. Grammar helps to rivet closer the links which bind together the writings of Luke, and those of Paul (though the Pastorals often need separate treatment); while the Johannine Gospel and Epistles similarly form a single grammatical entity. Whether the remaining Books add seven or nine to the tale of separate authors, does not concern us here; for the Apocalypse, 1 Peter and 2 Peter must be treated individually as much as Hebrews, whether the traditional authorship be accepted or rejected.

Last come the specific acknowledgements of most generous and welcome help received directly in the preparation of this volume. I count myself fortunate indeed in that three scholars of the first rank in different lines of study have read my proofs through, and helped me with invaluable encouragement and advice. It is only due to them that I should claim the sole responsibility for errors which I may have failed to escape, in spite of their watchfulness on my behalf. Two of them are old friends with whom I have taken counsel for many years. Dr G. G. Findlay has gone over my work with minute care, and has saved me from many a loose and ambiguous statement, besides giving me the fruit of his profound and accurate exegesis, which students of his works on St. Paul's Epistles know well. Dr Rendel Harris has brought me fresh lights from other points of view; and I have been particularly glad of criticism from a specialist in Syriac, who speaks with authority on matters which take a prominent place in my argument. The third name is that of Professor Albert Thumb, of Marburg. The kindness of this great scholar, in examining so carefully the work of one who is still *ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ*, cannot be adequately acknowledged here. Nearly every page of my book owes its debt either to his writings or to the criticisms and suggestions with which he has favoured me. At least twice he has called my attention to important articles in English which I had overlooked; and in my illustrations from Modern Greek I have felt myself able to venture often into fields which might have been full of pitfalls, had I not been secure in his expert guidance. Finally, in the necessary drudgery of index-making I have had welcome aid at home. By drawing up the index of Scripture quotations, my mother has done for me what she did for my father nearly forty years ago. My brother, the Rev. W. Fiddian Moulton, M.A., has spared time from a busy pastor's life to make me the Greek index. To all these who have helped me so freely, and to many others whose encouragement and counsel has been a constant stimulus—I would mention especially my Manchester colleagues, Dr R. W. Moss and Professor A. S. Peake—I tender my heartfelt thanks.

The new features of this edition are necessarily confined within narrow range. The Additional Notes are suggested by my own reading or by suggestions from various reviewers and correspondents, whose kindness I gratefully acknowledge. A new lecture by Professor Thumb, and reviews by such scholars as Dr Marcus Dods, Dr H. A. A. Kennedy, and Dr Souter, have naturally provided more material than I can at present use. My special thanks are due to Mr H. Scott, of Oxton, Birkenhead, who went over the index of texts and two or three complicated numerical computations in the body of the book, and sent me unsolicited some corrections and additions, for which the reader will add his gratitude to mine. As far as was possible, the numerous additions to the Indices have been worked in at their place; but some pages of Addenda have been necessary, which will not, I hope, seriously inconvenience the reader. The unbroken kindness of my reviewers makes it needless for me to reply to criticisms here. I am tempted to enlarge upon one or two remarks in the learned and helpful *Athenaeum* review, but will confine myself to a comment on the "awkward results" which the writer anticipates from the evidence of the papyri as set forth in my work. My *Prolegomena*, he says, "really prove that there can be no grammar of New Testament Greek, and that the grammar of the Greek in the New Testament is one and the same with the grammar of the 'common Greek' of the papyri." I agree with everything except the "awkwardness" of this result for me. To call this book a Grammar of the 'Common' Greek, and enlarge it by including phenomena which do not happen to be represented in the New Testament, would certainly be more scientific. But the practical advantages of confining attention to what concerns the grammatical interpretation of a Book of unique importance, written in a language which has absolutely no other literature worthy of the name, need hardly be laboured here, and this foreword is already long enough. I am as conscious as ever of the shortcomings of this book when placed in the succession of one which has so many associations of learning and industry, of caution and flawless accuracy. But I hope that its many deficiencies may not prevent it from leading its readers nearer to the meaning of the great literature which it strives to interpret. The new tool is certain not to be all its maker fondly wished it to be; but from a vein so rich in treasure even the poorest instrument can hardly fail to bring out nuggets of pure gold.

J. H. M.

DIDSBURY COLLEGE, *Aug.* 13, 1906.

NOTE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

As it is not yet three years since this book first appeared, I am spared the necessity of introducing very drastic change. Several new collections of papyri have been published, and other fresh material, of which I should have liked to avail myself more fully. But the alterations and additions have been limited by my wish not to disturb the pagination. Within this limit, however, I have managed to bring in a large number of small changes—removing obscurities, correcting mistakes, or registering a change of opinion; while, by the use of blank spaces, or the cutting down of superfluities, I have added very many fresh references. For the convenience of readers who possess former editions, I add below[1] a note of the pages on which changes or additions occur, other than those that are quite trifling. No small proportion of my time has been given to the Indices. Experience has shown that I had planned the Greek Index on too small a scale. In the expansion of this Index, as also for the correction of many statistics in the body of the book, I have again to acknowledge with hearty thanks the generous help of Mr

---

[1] See pp. xii., xx.–xxiii., 4, 7, 8, 10, 13–17, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45–50, 52–56, 64, 65, 67–69, 76–81, 86, 87, 93, 95–99, 101, 105, 107, 110, 113–115, 117, 119–121, 123, 125, 129, 130, 134, 135, 144, 145, 150, 156, 159, 161–163, 167, 168, 174, 176–179, 181, 185, 187, 188, 191, 193–196, 198, 200, 204, 205, 214, 215, 223–225, 227–231, 234–237, 239–241, 243–249. Pp. 260–265 have many alterations, Index iii a few. Index ii and the Addenda are new.

H. Scott. To the kindness of many reviewers and correspondents I must make a general acknowledgement for the help they have given me. One debt of this kind, however, I could not omit to mention, due to a learned member of my own College, who is working in the same field. The Accidence of Mr H. St. J. Thackeray's Septuagint Grammar is now happily far advanced towards publication; and I have had the privilege of reading it in MS, to my own great profit. I only wish I could have succeeded in my endeavour to provide ere now for my kind critics an instalment of the systematic grammar to which this volume is intended to be an introduction. It is small comfort that Prof. Schmiedel is still in the middle of the sentence where he left off ten years ago. The irreparable loss that Prof. Blass's death inflicts on our studies makes me more than ever wishful that Dr Schmiedel and his new coadjutor may not keep us waiting long.

Some important fields which I might have entered have been pointed out by Prof. S. Dickey, in the *Princeton Theological Review* for Jan. 1908, p. 151. Happily, I need not be exhaustive in *Prolegomena*, though the temptation to rove further is very strong. There is only one topic on which I feel it essential to enlarge at present, touching as it does my central position, that the New Testament was written in the normal *Κοινή* of the Empire, except for certain parts where over-literal translation from Semitic originals affected its quality. I must not here defend afresh the general thesis against attacks like that of Messrs Conybeare and Stock, delivered in advance in their excellent *Selections from the Septuagint*, p. 22 (1905), or Dr Nestle's review of my book in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for December 8, 1906. There are many points in this learned and suggestive review to which I hope to recur before long. But there is one new line essayed by some leading critics of Deissmannism—if I may coin a word on an obvious analogy—which claims a few words here. In the first additional note appended to my second edition (p. 242, below), I referred to the evidence for a large Aramaic-speaking Jewish population in Egypt, and anticipated the possibility that "Hebraists" might interpret our parallels from the papyri as Aramaisms of home growth.

As this argument had not yet been advanced, I did not offer an answer. But simultaneously Prof. Swete was bringing out his monumental Commentary on the Apocalypse; and I found on p. cxx that the veteran editor of the LXX was disposed to take this very line. The late Dr H. A. Redpath also wrote to me, referring to an article of his own in the *American Journal of Theology* for January 1903, pp. 10 f., which I should not have overlooked. With two such authorities to support this suggestion, I cannot of course leave the matter as it stands in the note referred to. Fuller discussion I must defer, but I may point out that our case does not rest on the papyri alone. Let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that we have no right to delete from the list of Hebraisms uses for which we can only quote Egyptian parallels, such as the use of *μετά* referred to on p. 246. There will still remain a multitude of uses in which we can support the papyri from vernacular inscriptions of different countries, without encountering any probability of Jewish influence. Take, for example, the case of instrumental ἐν, where the Hebrew בְּ has naturally been recognised by most scholars in the past. I have asserted (p. 12) that Ptolemaic exx. of ἐν μαχαίρῃ (Tb P 16 *al.*) rescue Paul's ἐν ῥάβδῳ from this category: before their discovery Dr Findlay (*EGT* on 1 Co 4^{21}) cited Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* xxiii. 3. Now let us suppose that the Egyptian official who wrote Tb P 16 was unconsciously using an idiom of the Ghetto, and that Lucian's Syrian origin—*credat Iudæus!*—was peeping out in a reminiscence of the nursery. We shall still be able to cite examples of the reckless extension of ἐν in Hellenistic of other countries; and we shall find that the roots of this particular extension go down deep into classical *usus loquendi*: see the quotations in Kühner-Gerth i. 465, and especially note the Homeric ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι Ϝιδέσθαι (*Il.* i. 587 *al.*) and ἐν πυρὶ καίειν (*Il.* xxiv. 38), which are quite near enough to explain the development. That some Biblical uses of ἐν go beyond even the generous limits of Hellenistic usage, neither Deissmann nor I seek to deny (see p. 104). But evidence accumulates to forbid my allowing Semitism as a *vera causa* for the mass of Biblical instances of ἐν in senses which make the Atticist stare and gasp. And on the general question I confess myself unconvinced that Egyptian Greek differs materially from that current in the Empire as a whole, or that the large Jewish population left their stamp on the language of Greeks or bilingual Egyptians in the Delta, any more than the perhaps equally large proportion of Jews in Manchester affects the speech of our Lancashire working men. There is another line of argument which I personally believe to be sound, but I do not press it here—the dogma of Thumb (see pp. 17 n. and 94 below), that a usage native in Modern Greek is *ipso facto* no Semitism. It has been pressed by Psichari in his valuable *Essai sur le grec de la Septante* (1908). But I have already overstepped the limits of a Preface, and will only express the earnest hope that the modest results of a laborious revision may make this book more helpful to the great company of Biblical students whom it is my ambition to serve.

J. H. M.

DIDSBURY COLLEGE, *Nov.* 6, 1908.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS	1
II.	HISTORY OF THE "COMMON" GREEK	22
III.	NOTES ON THE ACCIDENCE	42
IV.	SYNTAX: THE NOUN	57
V.	ADJECTIVES, PRONOUNS, PREPOSITIONS	77
VI.	THE VERB: TENSES AND MODES OF ACTION	108
VII.	THE VERB: VOICE	152
VIII.	THE VERB: THE MOODS	164
IX.	THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE	202
	ADDITIONAL NOTES	233
	ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE SECOND EDITION	242
	I. INDEX TO QUOTATIONS	250
	II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS	266
	III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS	278
	ADDENDA TO INDICES	290

ABBREVIATIONS.

Abbreviations for the names of Books of Scripture will explain themselves. In the OT and Apocrypha the names of the Books follow the English RV (except Ca for Song of Songs), as also do the numbers for chapter and verse: the LXX numbering, where it differs, is added within brackets.

Centuries are denoted iii/B.C., ii/A.D., etc., except when an exact date is given. Where the date may fall within wider limits, the notation is ii/i B.C., iv/v A.D., etc. Where papyri or inscriptions are not dated, it may generally be taken that no date is given by the editor.

The abbreviations for papyri and inscriptions are given in Index I (*c*) and (*d*), pp. 251 ff. below, with the full titles of the collections quoted.

The ordinary abbreviations for MSS, Versions, and patristic writers are used in textual notes.

Other abbreviations will, it is hoped, need no explanation: perhaps MGr for Modern Greek should be mentioned. It should be observed that references are to pages, unless otherwise stated: papyri and inscriptions are generally cited by number. In all these documents the usual notation is followed, and the original spelling preserved.

Abbott *JG*=*Johannine Grammar*, by E. A. Abbott. London 1906.

Abbott—see Index I (*e*) iii.

AJP=American Journal of Philology, ed. B. L. Gildersleeve, Baltimore 1880 ff.

Archiv—see Index I (*c*).

Audollent—see Index I (*c*).

BCH—see Index I (*c*).

Blass=Grammar of NT Greek, by F. Blass. Second English edition, tr. H. St J. Thackeray, London 1905. (This differs from ed. ^{1} only by the addition of pp. 306–333.) Sometimes the reference is to notes in Blass's *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen 1895): the context will make it clear.

Brugmann *Dist.*=Die distributiven u. d. kollektiven Numeralia der idg. Sprachen, by K. Brugmann. (*Abhandl. d. K. S. Ges. d. Wiss.*, xxv. v, Leipzig 1907.)

Burton *MT*=New Testament Moods and Tenses, by E. D. Burton. Second edition, Edinburgh 1894.

Buttmann=Grammar of New Testament Greek, by A. Buttmann. English edition by J. H. Thayer, Andover 1876.

BZ=Byzantinische Zeitschrift, ed. K. Krumbacher, Leipzig 1892 ff.

Cauer—see Index I (*c*).

CGT=Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.

CR=Classical Review (London 1887 ff.). Especially reference is made to the writer's collection of forms and syntactical examples from the papyri, in *CR* xv. 31–38 and 434–442 (Feb. and Dec. 1901), and xviii. 106–112 and 151–155 (March and April 1904—to be continued).

CQ=Classical Quarterly. London 1907 f.

Dalman *Words*=The Words of Jesus, by G. Dalman. English edition, tr. D. M. Kay, Edinburgh 1902.

Dalman *Gramm.*=Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch, by G. Dalman, Leipzig 1894.

DB=Dictionary of the Bible, edited by J. Hastings. 5 vols., Edinburgh 1898–1904.

Deissmann *BS*=Bible Studies, by G. A. Deissmann. English edition, including *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*, tr. A. Grieve, Edinburgh 1901.

Deissmann *In Christo*=Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu," by G. A. Deissmann, Marburg 1892.

Delbrück *Grundr.*=Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, by K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück: Dritter Band, Vergleichende Syntax, by Delbrück, Strassburg 1893–1900. (References to Brugmann's part, on phonology and morphology, are given to his own abridgement, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, 1904, which has also an abridged Comparative Syntax.)

Dieterich *Unters.*=Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr., by K. Dieterich, Leipzig 1898.

DLZ=Deutsche Literaturzeitung, Leipzig.

EB=Encyclopædia Biblica, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. 4 vols., London 1899–1903.

EGT=Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 4 vols. (vol. iv. not yet published), London 1897–1903.

Exp B=Expositor's Bible, edited by W. R. Nicoll. 49 vols., London 1887–1898.

Expos=The Expositor, edited by W. R. Nicoll. Cited by series, volume, and page. London 1875 ff.

Exp T=The Expository Times, edited by J. Hastings. Edinburgh 1889 ff.

Gildersleeve Studies=Studies in Honor of Professor Gildersleeve, Baltimore.

Gildersleeve *Synt.*=Syntax of Classical Greek, by B. L. Gildersleeve and C. W. E. Miller. Part i, New York 1900.

Giles *Manual* ^{2}=A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for classical students, by P. Giles. Second edition, London 1901.

Goodwin *MT*=Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb, by W. W. Goodwin. Third edition, London 1889.

Goodwin *Greek Gram.*=A Greek Grammar, by W. W. Goodwin. London 1894.

Grimm-Thayer=Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, translated and enlarged by J. H. Thayer, as "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament." Edinburgh 1886.

Hatzidakis = Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik, by G. N. Hatzidakis. Leipzig 1892.

Hawkins *HS* = Horæ Synopticæ, by J. C. Hawkins. Oxford 1899.

HR = A Concordance to the Septuagint, by E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. Oxford 1897.

IMA—see Index I (*c*).

Indog. Forsch. = Indogermanische Forschungen, edited by K. Brugmann and W. Streitberg. Strassburg 1892 ff.

Jannaris *HG* = A Historical Greek Grammar, by A. N. Jannaris. London 1897.

JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature. Boston 1881 ff.

JHS—see Index I (*c*).

JTS = Journal of Theological Studies. London 1900 ff.

Jülicher *Introd.* = Introduction to the New Testament, by A. Jülicher. English edition, tr. by J. P. Ward, London 1904.

Kälker = Quæstiones de elocutione Polybiana, by F. Kaelker. In *Leipziger Studien* III. ii., 1880.

Kühner³, or Kühner-Blass, Kühner-Gerth = Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, by R. Kühner. Third edition, *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, by F. Blass. 2 vols., Hannover 1890–2. *Satzlehre*, by B. Gerth. 2 vols., 1898, 1904.

Kuhring *Praep.* = De Praepositionum Graec. in chartis Aegyptiis usu, by W. Kuhring. Bonn 1906.

KZ = Kuhn's Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Berlin and Gütersloh 1852 ff.

LS = A Greek-English Lexicon, by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. Eighth edition, Oxford 1901.

Mayser = Grammatik der gr. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, by E. Mayser. Leipzig 1906.

Meisterhans³ = Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, by K. Meisterhans. Third edition by E. Schwyzer (see p. 29 n.), Berlin 1900.

MG = Concordance to the Greek Testament, by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. Edinburgh 1897.

Milligan-Moulton = Commentary on the Gospel of St John, by W. Milligan and W. F. Moulton. Edinburgh 1898.

Mithraslit.—see Index I (*d*).

Monro *HG* = Homeric Grammar, by D. B. Monro. Second edition, Oxford 1891.

Nachmanson = Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften, by E. Nachmanson, Uppsala 1903.

Ramsay *Paul* = Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, by W. M. Ramsay Third edition, London 1897.

Ramsay *C. and B.*—see Index I (*c*).

*RE*³ = Herzog-Hauck *Realencyclopädie.* (In progress.) Leipzig.

REGr = Revue des Études grecques. Paris 1888 ff.

Reinhold = De Græcitate Patrum, by H. Reinhold. Halle 1898.

RhM = Rheinisches Museum. Bonn 1827 ff.

Riddell = A Digest of Platonic Idioms, by J. Riddell (in his edition of the *Apology*, Oxford 1867).

Rutherford *NP* = The New Phrynichus, by W. G. Rutherford, London 1881.

Schanz *Beitr.* = Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache, edited by M. Schanz. Würtzburg 1882 ff.

Schmid *Attic.* = Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus, by W. Schmid. 4 vols. and Register, Stuttgart 1887–1897.

Schmidt *Jos.* = De Flavii Josephi elocutione, by W. Schmidt, Leipzig 1893.

Schulze *Gr. Lat.* = Graeca Latina, by W. Schulze, Göttingen 1901.

Schwyzer *Perg.* = Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften, by E. Schweizer (see p. 29 n.), Berlin 1898.

SH = The Epistle to the Romans, by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam. Fifth edition, Edinburgh 1902.

ThLZ = Theologische Literaturzeitung, edited by A. Harnack and E. Schürer, Leipzig 1876 ff.

Thumb *Hellen.* = Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, by A. Thumb, Strassburg 1901.

Thumb *Handb.* = Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache, by A. Thumb, Strassburg 1895.

Ti = Novum Testamentum Graece, by C. Tischendorf. Editio octava critica maior. 2 vols., Leipzig 1869–72. Also vol. iii, by C. R. Gregory, containing Prolegomena, 1894.

Viereck *SG*—see Index I (c).

Viteau = Étude sur le grec du Noveau Testament, by J. Viteau. Vol. i, Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions, Paris 1893; vol. ii, Sujet, Complément et Attribut, 1896.

Völker = Syntax der griechischen Papyri. I. Der Artikel, by F. Völker, Münster i. W. 1903.

Votaw = The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek, by C. W. Votaw. Chicago 1896.

Wellh. = Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, by J. Wellhausen. Berlin 1905.

WH = The New Testament in the Original Greek, by B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. Vol. i, Text (also ed. minor); vol. ii, Introduction. Cambridge and London 1881; second edition of vol. ii, 1896.

WH *App* = Appendix to WH, in vol. ii, containing Notes on Select Readings and on Orthography, etc.

Witk. = Epistulae Privatae Graecae, ed. S. Witkowski. Leipzig 1906.

WM = A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, regarded as a sure basis for New Testament Exegesis, by G. B. Winer. Translated from the German, with large additions and full indices, by W. F. Moulton. Third edition, Edinburgh 1882.

WS = G. B. Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms. Eighth edition, newly edited by P. W. Schmiedel, Göttingen 1894 ff. (In progress.)

ZNTW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, edited by E. Preuschen. Giessen 1900 ff.

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

PROLEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS.

New Lights. As recently as 1895, in the opening chapter of a beginner's manual of New Testament Greek, the present writer defined the language as "*Hebraic* Greek, *colloquial* Greek, and *late* Greek." In this definition the characteristic features of the dialect were expressed according to a formula which was not questioned then by any of the leading writers on the subject. It was entirely approved by Dr W. F. Moulton, who would undoubtedly at that time have followed these familiar lines, had he been able to achieve his long cherished purpose of rewriting his English *Winer* as an independent work. It is not without imperative reason that, in this first instalment of a work in which I hoped to be my father's collaborator, I have been compelled seriously to modify the position he took, in view of fresh evidence which came too late for him to examine. In the second edition of the manual referred to,[1] "*common* Greek" is substituted for the first element in the definition. The disappearance of that word "Hebraic" from its prominent place in our delineation of NT language marks a change in our conceptions of the subject nothing less than revolutionary. This is not a revolution in theory alone. It touches exegesis at innumerable points. It demands large modifications in our very latest grammars, and an overhauling of our best and most trusted commentaries. To write a new Grammar, so soon after the appearance of fresh light which transforms in very important respects our whole point of view, may seem a premature undertaking. But it must not be supposed that we are concerned with a revolutionary theory which needs time for readjusting our science to new conditions. The development of the Greek language, in the period which separates Plato and Demosthenes from our own days, has been patiently studied for a generation, and the main lines of a scientific history have been thoroughly established. What has happened to our own particular study is only the discovery of its unity with the larger science which has been maturing steadily all the time. "Biblical Greek" was long supposed to lie in a backwater: it has now been brought out into the full stream of progress. It follows that we have now fresh material for illustrating our subject, and a more certain methodology for the use of material which we had already at hand.

---

[1] *Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek*, with a *First Reader*. Second Edition, 1904 (C. H. Kelly—now R. Culley).

"Biblical Greek."

The isolated position of the Greek found in the LXX and the NT has been the problem dividing grammatical students of this literature for generations past. That the Greek Scriptures, and the small body of writings which in language go with them, were written in the *Κοινή*, the "common" or "Hellenistic" Greek[1] that superseded the dialects of the classical period, was well enough known. But it was most obviously different from the literary *Κοινή* of the period. It could not be adequately paralleled from Plutarch or Arrian, and the Jewish writers Philo and Josephus[2] were no more helpful than their "profane" contemporaries. Naturally the peculiarities of Biblical Greek came to be explained from its own conditions. The LXX was in "translation Greek," its syntax determined perpetually by that of the original Hebrew. Much the same was true of large parts of the NT, where translation had taken place from an original Aramaic. But even where this was not the case, it was argued, the writers used Greek as foreigners, Aramaic thought underlying Greek expression. Moreover, they were so familiar with the LXX that its idiosyncrasies passed largely into their own style, which accordingly was charged with Semitisms from two distinct sources. Hence this "Judaic" or "Biblical" Greek, this "language of the Holy Ghost,"[1] found in the sacred writings and never profaned by common use. It was a phenomenon against which the science of language could raise no *a priori* objection. The Purist, who insisted on finding parallels in classical Greek literature for everything in the Greek NT, found his task impossible without straining language to the breaking-point. His antagonist the Hebraist went absurdly far in recognising Semitic influence where none was really operative. But when a grammarian of balanced judgement like G. B. Winer came to sum up the bygone controversy, he was found admitting enough Semitisms to make the Biblical Greek essentially an isolated language still.

---

[1] I shall use the terms *Hellenistic*, *Hellenist*, and *Hellenism* throughout for the Greek of the later period, which had become coextensive with Western civilisation.

[2] See below, p. 233.

Greek Papyri: Deissmann.

It is just this isolation which the new evidence comes in to destroy.[a] The Greek papyri of Egypt are in themselves nothing novel; but their importance for the historical study of the language did not begin to be realised until, within the last decade or so, the explorers began to enrich us with an output of treasure which has been perpetually fruitful in surprises. The attention of the classical world has been busy with the lost treatise of Aristotle and the new poets Bacchylides and Herodas, while theologians everywhere have eagerly discussed new "Sayings of Jesus." But even these last must yield in importance to the spoil which has been gathered from the wills, official reports, private letters, petitions, accounts, and other trivial survivals from the rubbish-heaps of antiquity.[b] They were studied by a young investigator of genius, at that time known only by one small treatise on the Pauline formula *ἐν Χριστῷ*, which to those who read it now shows abundantly the powers that were to achieve such splendid pioneer work within three or four years. Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* appeared in 1895, his *Neue Bibelstudien*[1] in 1897. It is needless to describe how these lexical researches in the papyri and the later inscriptions proved that hundreds of words, hitherto assumed to be "Biblical,"—technical words, as it were, called into existence or minted afresh by the language of Jewish religion,—were in reality normal first-century spoken Greek, excluded from literature by the nice canons of Atticising taste. Professor Deissmann dealt but briefly with the grammatical features of this newly-discovered Greek; but no one charged with the duty of editing a Grammar of NT Greek could read his work without seeing that a systematic grammatical study in this field was the indispensable equipment for such a task. In that conviction the present writer set himself to the study of the collections which have poured with bewildering rapidity from the busy workshops of Oxford and Berlin, and others, only less conspicuous. The lexical gleanings after Deissmann which these researches have produced, almost entirely in documents published since his books were written, have enabled me to confirm his conclusions from independent investigation.[2] A large part of my grammatical material is collected in a series of papers in the *Classical Review* (see p. xxi.), to which I shall frequently have to make reference in the ensuing pages as supplying in detail the evidence for the results here to be described.

---

[1] So Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of NT Greek*, p. iv (E.T.), following Rothe. (Cited by Thumb, *Hellenismus* 181.) [[a] [b] See p. 242

Vernacular Greek.

The new linguistic facts now in evidence show with startling clearness that we have at last before us the language in which the apostles and evangelists wrote. The papyri exhibit in their writers a variety of literary education even wider than that observable in the NT, and we can match each sacred author with documents that in respect of Greek stand on about the same plane. The conclusion is that "Biblical" Greek, except where it is translation Greek, was simply the vernacular of daily life.[3] Men who aspired to literary fame wrote in an artificial dialect, a would-be revival of the language of Athens in her prime, much as educated Greeks of the present day profess to do. The NT writers had little idea that they were writing literature. The Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people, as we might surely have expected He would. The writings inspired of Him were those

---

[1] See p. xxi. above.

[2] See *Expositor* for April 1901, Feb. and Dec. 1903; and new series in 1908.

[3] Cf Wellhausen (*Einl.* 9): "In the Gospels, spoken Greek, and indeed Greek spoken among the lower classes, makes its entrance into literature."

> Which he may read that binds the sheaf,
> Or builds the house, or digs the grave,
> And those wild eyes that watch the wave
> In roarings round the coral reef.

The very grammar and dictionary cry out against men who would allow the Scriptures to appear in any other form than that "understanded of the people."

A Universal Language.

There is one very striking fact brought out by the study of papyri and inscriptions which preserve for us the Hellenistic vernacular. It was a language without serious dialectic differences, except presumably in pronunciation. The history of this *lingua franca* must be traced in a later chapter. Here it suffices to point out that in the first centuries of our era Greek covered a far larger proportion of the civilised world than even English does to-day.[a] The well-known heroics of Juvenal (iii. 60 f.)—

> Non possum ferre, Quirites,
> Graecam Urbem—,

joined with the Greek "*Εἰς Ἑαυτόν*" of the Roman Emperor and the Greek *Epistle to the Romans*, serve as obvious evidence that a man need have known little Latin to live in Rome itself.[1] It was not Italy but Africa that first called for a Latin Bible.[2] That the Greek then current in almost every part of the Empire was virtually uniform is at first a startling fact, and to no one so startling as to a student of the science of language. Dialectic differentiation is the root principle of that science;[3]

---

[1] Cf A. S. Wilkins, *Roman Education* 19; SH lii ff.

[2] So at least most critics believe. Dr Sanday, however, prefers Antioch, which suits our point equally well. Rome is less likely. See Dr Kennedy in Hastings' *BD* iii. 54.

[3] See, for instance, the writer's *Two Lectures on the Science of Language*, pp. 21-23.

[[a] See p. 242

and when we know how actively it works within the narrow limits of Great Britain, it seems strange that it should apparently be suspended in the vast area covered by Hellenistic Greek. We shall return to this difficulty later (pp. 19–39): for the present we must be content with the fact that any dialect variation that did exist is mostly beyond the range of our present knowledge to detect. Inscriptions, distributed over the whole area, and dated with precision enough to trace the slow development of the vernacular as it advanced towards Mediæval and Modern Greek, present us with a grammar which only lacks homogeneity according as their authors varied in culture. As we have seen, the papyri of Upper Egypt tally in their grammar with the language seen in the NT, as well as with inscriptions like those of Pergamum and Magnesia. No one can fail to see how immeasurably important these conditions were for the growth of Christianity. The historian marks the fact that the Gospel began its career of conquest at the one period in the world's annals when civilisation was concentrated under a single ruler. The grammarian adds that this was the only period when a single language was understood throughout the countries which counted for the history of that Empire. The historian and the grammarian must of course refrain from talking about "Providence." They would be suspected of "an apologetic bias" or "an edifying tone," and that is necessarily fatal to any reputation for scientific attainment. We will only remark that some old-fashioned people are disposed to see in these facts a *σημεῖον* in its way as instructive as the Gift of Tongues.

Bilingualism It is needless to observe that except in the Greek world, properly so called, Greek did not hold a monopoly. Egypt throughout the long period of the Greek papyri is very strongly bilingual, the mixture of Greek and native names in the same family, and the prevalence of double nomenclature, often making it difficult to tell the race of an individual.[1] A bilingual country

---

[1] It should be noted that in the papyri we have not to do only with Egyptians and Greeks. In Par P 48 (153 B.C.) there is a letter addressed to an Arab by two of his brothers. The editor, M. Brunet de Presle, remarks as follows on this:—"It is worth our while to notice the rapid diffusion of Greek,

in Palestine.

is vividly presented to us in the narrative of Ac 14, where the apostles preach in Greek and are unable to understand the excited populace when they relapse into Lycaonian. What the local Greek was like, we may gauge from such specimens as the touching Christian epitaph published by Mr Cronin in *JHS*, 1902, p. 369 (see *Exp T* xiv. 430), and dated "little if at all later than iii/A.D." We need not develop the evidence for other countries: it is more to the point if we look at the conditions of a modern bilingual country, such as we have at home in the country of Wales. Any popular English politician or preacher, visiting a place in the heart of the Principality, could be sure of an audience, even if it were assumed that he would speak in English. If he did, they would understand him. But should he unexpectedly address them in Welsh, we may be very sure they would be "the more quiet"; and a speaker anxious to conciliate a hostile meeting would gain a great initial advantage if he could surprise them with the sound of their native tongue.[1] Now this is exactly what happened when Paul addressed the Jerusalem mob from the stairs of Antonia. They took for granted he would speak in Greek, and yet they made "a great silence" when he faced them with the gesture which indicated a wish to address them. Schürer nods, for once, when he calls in Paul's Aramaic speech as a witness of the people's ignorance of Greek.[2] It does not prove even the "inadequate" knowledge which he gives as the alternative possibility for the lower classes, if by "inadequate know-

---

after Alexander's conquest, among a mass of people who in all other respects jealously preserved their national characteristics under foreign masters. The papyri show us Egyptians, Persians, Jews, and here Arabs, who do not appear to belong to the upper classes, using the Greek language. We must not be too exacting towards them in the matter of style. Nevertheless the letter which follows is almost irreproachable in syntax and orthography, which does not always happen even with men of Greek birth." If these remarks, published in 1865, had been followed up as they deserved, Deissmann would have come too late. It is strange how little attention was aroused by the great collections of papyri at Paris and London, until the recent flood of discovery set in.

[1] These words were written before I had read Dr T. K. Abbott's able, but not always conclusive, article in his volume of *Essays*. On p. 164 he gives an incident from bilingual Ireland exactly parallel with that imagined above. Prof. T. H. Williams tells me he has often heard Welsh teachers illustrating the narrative of Ac 21^{40} 22^{2} in the same way: cf also A. S. Wilkins, *CR* ii. 142 f. (On Lystra, see p. 233.)

[2] *Jewish People*, II. i. 48 (=^{3} II. 63).

ledge" is implied that the crowd would have been unable to follow a Greek speech. They thought and spoke among themselves, like the Welsh, exclusively in their native tongue; but we may well doubt if there were many of them who could not understand the world-language, or even speak in it when necessary.[1] We have in fact a state of things essentially the same as in Lystra. But the imperfect knowledge of Greek which may be assumed for the masses in Jerusalem and Lystra is decidedly less probable for Galilee and Peræa. Hellenist Jews, ignorant of Aramaic, would be found there as in Jerusalem; and the proportion of foreigners would be much larger. That Jesus Himself and the Apostles regularly used Aramaic is beyond question, but that Greek was also at command is almost equally certain. There is not the slightest presumption against the use of Greek in writings purporting to emanate from the circle of the first believers.[2] They would write as men who had used the language from boyhood, not as foreigners painfully expressing themselves in an imperfectly known idiom. Their Greek would differ in quality according to their education, like that of the private letters among the Egyptian papyri. But it does not appear that any of them used Greek as we may sometimes find cultured foreigners using English, obviously translating out of their own language as they go along. Even the Greek of the Apocalypse itself[3] does not seem to owe any

---

[1] The evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine is very fully stated by Zahn in his *Einl. in das NT*, ch. ii. Cf also Jülicher in *EB* ii. 2007 ff. Mahaffy (*Hellenism*, 130 f.) overdoes it when he says, "Though we may believe that in Galilee and among his intimates our Lord spoke Aramaic, and though we know that some of his last words upon the cross were in that language, yet his public teaching, his discussions with the Pharisees, his talk with Pontius Pilate, were certainly carried on in Greek." Dr Nestle misunderstands me when he supposes me to endorse in any way Prof. Mahaffy's exaggeration here. It would be hard to persuade modern scholars that Christ's *public teaching* was mainly in Greek; and I should not dream of questioning His daily use of Aramaic. My own view is that which is authoritatively expressed in the remarks of Profs. Driver and Sanday (*DB* iv. 583*a*) as to our Lord's occasional use of Greek. Cf Ramsay, *Pauline Studies* 254; Nicklin, *CR* xx. 465; Mahaffy, *Silver Age* 250; Mayor, *St James* xlii.

[2] Dr T. K. Abbott (*Essays* 170) points out that Justin Martyr, brought up near Sichem early in ii/A.D., depends entirely on the LXX—a circumstance which is ignored by Mgr Barnes in his attempt to make a different use of Justin (*JTS* vi. 369). (See further below, p. 233.)

[3] On Prof. Swete's criticism here see my Preface, p. xvii.

Apocalypse. of its blunders to "Hebraism." The author's uncertain use of cases is obvious to the most casual reader. In any other writer we might be tempted to spend time over τὰς λυχνίας in 1^{20}, where τῶν λυχνιῶν is clearly needed: for him it is enough to say that the neighbouring οὗς may have produced the aberration. We find him perpetually indifferent to concord. But the less educated papyri give us plentiful parallels from a field where Semitism cannot be suspected.[1] After all, we do not suspect Shakspere of foreign upbringing because he says "between you and I."[2] Neither he nor his unconscious imitators in modern times would say "between I and you," any more than the author of the Apocalypse would have said ἀπὸ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός (1^5): it is only that his grammatical sense is satisfied when the governing word has affected the case of one object.[3] We shall find that other peculiarities of the writer's Greek are on the same footing. Apart from places where he may be definitely translating a Semitic document, there is no reason to believe that his grammar would have been materially different had he been a native of Oxyrhynchus, assuming the extent of Greek education the same.[4] Close to

---

[1] See my exx. of nom. in apposition to noun in another case, and of gender neglected, in *CR* xviii. 151. Cf also below, p. 60. (Ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν, 1^4, is of course an intentional *tour de force.*) Note the same thing in the δ-text of 2 Th 1^8, Ἰησοῦ . . . διδούς (D*FG and some Latin authorities).

[2] *Merchant of Venice*, III. ii. (end—Antonio's letter).

[3] There are parallels to this in correct English. "Drive far away the disastrous Kêres, *they* who destroy" (Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 168) would not be mended by substituting *them.*

[4] The grammatical peculiarities of the book are conveniently summarised in a few lines by Jülicher, *Introd. to NT*, p. 273: for a full account see the introduction to Bousset's Commentary, in the Meyer series. It may be well to observe, *à propos* of the curious Greek of Rev, that grammar here must play a part in literary criticism. It will not do to appeal to grammar to prove that the author is a Jew: as far as that goes, he might just as well have been a farmer of the Fayûm. Thought and material must exclusively determine that question. But as that point is hardly doubtful, we pass on to a more important inference from the imperfect Greek culture of this book. If its date was 95 A.D, the author cannot have written the fourth Gospel only a short time after. Either, therefore, we must take the earlier date for Rev, which would allow the Apostle to improve his Greek by constant use in a city like Ephesus where his Aramaic would be useless; or we must suppose that someone (say, the author of Jn 21^{24}) mended his grammar for him throughout the Gospel

Paul, Luke, "Hebrews."

the other end of the scale comes the learned Rabbi of Tarsus. "A Hebrew, the son of Hebrews," he calls himself (Phil 3^5), and Zahn is no doubt right in inferring that he always claimed Aramaic as his mother tongue. But he had probably used Greek from childhood with entire freedom, and during the main part of his life may have had few opportunities of using Aramaic at all. It is highly precarious to argue with Zahn from "*Abba*, Father" (Rom 8^{15}, Gal 4^6), that Aramaic was the language of Paul's prayers. The peculiar sacredness of association belonging to the first word of the Lord's Prayer in its original tongue supplies a far more probable account of its liturgical use among Gentile Christians.[1] Finally, we have the Gentile Luke[2] and the *auctor ad Hebraeos*, both of whom may well have known no Aramaic at all: to the former we must return presently. Between these extremes the NT writers lie; and of them all we may assert with some confidence that, where translation is not involved, we shall find hardly any Greek expression used which would sound strangely to speakers of the *Κοινή* in Gentile lands.

Genuine Semitisms.

To what extent then should we expect to find the style of Jewish Greek writers coloured by the influence of Aramaic or Hebrew? Here our Welsh analogy helps us. Captain Fluellen is marked in Shakspere not only by his Welsh pronunciation of English, but also by his fondness for the phrase "look you." Now "look you" is English: I am told it is common in the Dales, and if we could dissociate it from Shakspere's Welshman we should probably not be struck by it as a bizarre expression. But why does Fluellen use it so often? Because

---

Otherwise, we must join the Χωρίζοντες. Dr Bartlet (in *Exp T* for Feb. 1905, p. 206) puts Rev under Vespasian and assigns it to the author of Jn: he thinks that Prof. Ramsay's account (*Seven Churches*, p. 89) does not leave sufficient time for the development of Greek style. We can now quote for the earlier date the weightiest of all English authorities: see Hort's posthumous *Commentary* (with Sanday's half consent in the Preface).

[1] Cf Bp Chase, in *Texts and Studies*, I. iii. 23. This is not very different from the devout Roman Catholic's "saying *Paternoster*"; but Paul will not allow even one word of prayer in a foreign tongue without adding an instant translation. Note that *Pader* is the Welsh name for the Lord's Prayer. (See p. 233.)

[2] Cf Dalman, *Words*, 40 f.

it translates two or three Welsh phrases of nearly identical meaning, which would be very much on his tongue when talking with his own countrymen. For the same reason the modern Welshman overdoes the word "indeed." In exactly the same way the good Attic interjection *ἰδού* is used by some NT writers, with a frequency quite un-Attic, simply because they were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection in their own tongue.[1] Probably this is the furthest extent to which Semitisms went in the ordinary Greek speech or writing of men whose native language was Semitic. It brought into prominence locutions, correct enough as Greek, but which would have remained in comparatively rare use but for the accident of their answering to Hebrew or Aramaic phrases. Occasionally, moreover, a word with some special metaphorical meaning might be translated into the literally corresponding Greek and used with the same connotation, as when the verb הלך, in the ethical sense, was represented not by the exactly answering *ἀναστρέφεσθαι*, but by *περιπατεῖν*.[2] But these cases are very few, and may be transferred any day to the other category, illustrated above in the case of *ἰδού*, by the discovery of new papyrus texts. It must not be forgotten that the instrumental *ἐν* in *ἐν μαχαίρῃ* (Lk 22^{49}) and *ἐν ῥάβδῳ* (1 Co 4^{21}) was only rescued from the class of "Hebraisms" by the publication of the *Tebtunis Papyri* (1902), which presented us with half-a-dozen Ptolemaic citations for it.[1]

---

[1] Note that James uses *ἰδού* 6 times in his short Epistle, Paul only 9 times (including one quotation) in all his writings. In Ac 1–12 it appears 16 times, in 13–28 only 7: its rarity in the Gentile atmosphere is characteristic. It is instructive to note the figures for narrative as against speeches and OT quotations. Mt has 33 in narrative, 4 in quotations, 24 in speeches; Mk 0/1/6; Lk 16/1/40; Ac (1–12) 4/0/12, Ac (13–28) 1/0/6; Jn 0/1/3. Add that Heb has 4 OT quotations and no other occurrence, and Rev has no less than 26 occurrences. It is obvious that it was natural to Hebrews in speech, and to some of them (not Mk or Jn) in narrative. Luke in the Palestinian atmosphere (Lk, Ac 1–12) employs it freely, whether reproducing his sources or bringing in a trait of local character like Shakspere with Fluellen. Hort (*Ecclesia*, p. 179) says *ἰδού* is "a phrase which when writing in his own person and sometimes even in speeches [Luke] reserves for sudden and as it were providential interpositions." He does not appear to include the Gospel, to which the remark is evidently inapplicable, and this fact somewhat weakens its application to Ac 1–12. But with this reservation we may accept the independent testimony of Hort's instinct to our conclusion that Luke when writing without external influences upon him would use *ἰδού* as a Greek would use it. The same is true of Paul. Let me quote in conclusion a curiously close parallel, unfortunately late (iv/v A.D.) to Lk 13^{16}: BU 948 (a letter) *γινώσκειν ἐθέλω ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ πραγματευτὴς ὅτι ἡ μήτηρ σου ἀσθενῖ, εἰδοῦ, δέκα τρῖς μῆνες.* (See p. 70.) It weakens the case for Aramaism (Wellh. 29).

[2] Deissmann, *BS* 194. *Πορεύομαι* is thus used in 1 Pet 4^3 *al.* Cf *στοιχεῖν*.

Grammatical and Lexical. A very important distinction must be drawn at this point between Semitisms concerning vocabulary and those which affect syntax. The former have occupied us mainly so far, and they are the principal subject of Deissmann's work. *Grammatical* Semitisms are a much more serious matter. We might indeed range under this head all sins against native Greek style and idiom, such as most NT books will show. Co-ordination of clauses with the simple *καί*,[2] instead of the use of participles or subordinate clauses, is a good example. It is quite true that a Hebrew would find this style come natural to him, and that an Egyptian might be more likely, in equal absence of Greek culture, to pile up a series of genitive absolutes. But in itself the phenomenon proves nothing more than would a string of "ands" in an English rustic's story—elementary culture, and not the hampering presence of a foreign idiom that is being perpetually translated into its most literal equivalent. A Semitism which definitely contravenes Greek syntax is what we have to watch for. We have seen that *ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός* does not come into this category. But Rev 2^{13} *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς . . . ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη* would be a glaring example, for it is impossible to conceive of *Ἀντίπας* as an indeclinable. The Hebraist might be supposed to argue that the nom. is unchanged because it would be unchanged (*stat. abs.*) in Hebrew. But no one would seriously imagine the text sound: it matters little whether we mend it with Lachmann's conjecture *Ἀντίπα* or with that of the later copyists, who repeat *αἷς* after *ἡμέραις* and drop *ὅς*. The typical case of *ἐγένετο ἦλθε* will be discussed below;

---

[1] *Expos.* VI. vii. 112; cf *CR* xviii. 153, and Preface, p. xvii. above.

[2] Cf Hawkins *HS* 120 f., on the frequency of *καί* in Mk. Thumb observes that *καί* in place of hypotaxis is found in MGr—and in Aristotle (*Hellenismus* 129): here even Viteau gives way. So *ἦρθε καιρὸς κι' ἀρρώστησεν* (Abbott 70). The simple parataxis of Mk 15^{25}, Jn 4^{35} 11^{55}, is illustrated by the uneducated document Par P 18, *ἔτι δύο ἡμέρας ἔχομεν καὶ φθάσομεν εἰς Πηλούσι.*

and in the course of our enquiry we shall dispose of others, like ἧς τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς (Mk 7^{25}), which we now find occurring in Greek that is beyond suspicion of Semitic influences.

Translation Greek.

There remain Semitisms due to translation, from the Hebrew of the OT, or from Aramaic "sources" underlying parts of the Synoptists and Acts. The former case covers all the usages which have been supposed to arise from over-literal rendering in the LXX, the constant reading of which by Hellenist Jews has unconsciously affected their Greek. In the LXX we may have abnormal Greek produced by the effort of Greek-speaking men to translate the already obsolete and imperfectly understood Hebrew: when the Hebrew puzzled them, they would often take refuge in a barbarous literalness.[1] It is not antecedently probable that such "translation Greek" would influence free Greek except by supplying phrases for conscious or unconscious quotation: these phrases would not become models to be followed by men who wrote the language as their own. How far such foreign idioms may get into a language, we may see by examining our own. We have a few foreign phrases which have been literally translated into English, and have maintained their place without consciousness of their origin: "that goes without saying," or "this gives furiously to think," will serve as examples. Many more are retained as conscious quotations, with no effort to assimilate them to English idiom. "To return to our muttons" illustrates one kind of these barbarisms; but there are Biblical phrases taken over in a similar way without sacrificing their unidiomatic form. We must notice, however, that such phrases are sterile: we have only to imagine another verb put for *saying* in our version of *Cela va sans dire* to see how it has failed to take root in our syntax.

Hebraism in Luke.

The general discussion of this important subject may be clinched with an enquiry into the diction of Luke, whose varieties of style in the different parts of his work form a particularly interesting and important problem.[1] I restrict myself to grammatical Hebraisms mainly, but it will be useful to recall Dalman's list (*Words* 20 ff.) to see how far Luke is concerned in it. He gives as pure Aramaisms (*a*) the superfluous *ἀφείς* or *καταλιπών* and *ἤρξατο*, as more Aramaic than Hebrew the use of *εἶναι* with participle as a narrative tense. Either Aramaic or Hebrew will account for (*b*) the superfluous *ἐλθών*,[2] *καθίσας*, *ἑστώς*, and *ἀναστάς* or *ἐγερθείς*. Pure Hebraisms are (*c*) the periphrases with *πρόσωπον*, the use of *ἐν τῷ* with infinitive,[3] the types *ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε* and *βλέποντες βλέψετε* (see below, pp. 75 f.), and the formulæ *καὶ ἐγένετο*, *ἐλάλησεν λαλῶν* and *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*.[4] In class (*a*), we find Luke unconcerned with the first case. The third we must return to (see pp. 225 ff.): suffice to say now that it has its roots in classical Greek, and is at most only a more liberal use of what is correct enough, if less common. But *ἤρξατο* raises an interesting question. In Lk 3^{8} we find *καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.* Dalman (p. 27) shows that in narrative "the Palestinian-Jewish literature uses the meaningless 'he began,'" a conventional locution which was evidently parallel with our Middle-English auxiliary *gan.* It is very common in the Synoptists, and occurs twice as often in Luke as in Matthew. Dalman thinks that if this Aramaic שָׁרִי with participle had become practically meaningless, we might well find the same use in direct speech, though no example happens to be known. Now in the otherwise verbally identical verse Mt 3^{9} we find *δόξητε* for *ἄρξησθε*, "do not presume to say," which is thoroughly idiomatic Greek, and manifestly a deliberate improvement of an original preserved more exactly by Luke.[1] It seems to follow that this original was a Greek translation of the Aramaic *logia*-document, used in common by both Evangelists, but with greater freedom by the first. If Luke was ignorant of Aramaic,[2] he would be led by his keen desire for accuracy to incorporate with a minimum of change translations he was able to secure, even when they were executed by men whose Greek was not very idiomatic. This conclusion, which is in harmony with our general impressions of his methods of using his sources, seems to me much more probable than to suppose that it was he who misread Aramaic words in the manner illustrated by Nestle on Lk $11^{41\,\mathrm{f.}}$ (*Exp T* xv. 528): we may just as well accuse the (oral or written) translation he employed.

---

[1] My illustration here from Aquila (Gen 1^{1}) was unfortunate: cf Swete's *Introd.* 458 f. Better ones may be seen in Mr Thackeray's "Jer β" (see *JTS* ix. 94). He gives me ἐσθίειν τὴν τράπεζαν in 2 K 19^{28} *al*—also in the Greek additions to Esther (C^{28}). Was this from some Greek original of Vergil's *consumere mensas*, or was it a "Biblical" phrase perpetuated in the Biblical style?

---

[1] In assuming the unity of the two books *ad Theophilum*, I was quite content to shield myself behind Blass; but Harnack has now stepped in with decisive effect. The following pages will supply not a few grammatical points to supplement Harnack's stylistic evidence in *Luke the Physician*.

[2] A fair vernacular parallel in *Syll.*^{2} 807 (ii/A.D.) *καὶ ἐσώθη καὶ ἐλθὼν δημοσίᾳ ηὐχαρίστησεν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ δήμου.*

[3] See Kälker 252, and below, p. 215. Add Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) *τίς γὰρ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἀνάλητος* (?) *ἢ ἄλιτρος ἐν τῷ λογίζεσθαι καὶ πράγματος διαφορὰν εὑρεῖν, ὃς οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο δυνήσεται συννοεῖν*; "so utterly wanting in reason" (Mahaffy). It is of course the *frequency* of this locution that is due to Semitic thought: cf what is said of *ἰδού*, above, p. 11. But see p. 249.

[4] See Wellh. 16. To class (*c*) I may append a note on *εἰς ἀπάντησιν*, which in Mt 27^{32} (δ-text) and 1 Th 4^{17} takes a genitive. This is of course a very literal translation of לִקְרַאת, which is given by HR as its original in 29 places, as against 16 with dative. (Variants *συναν.*, *ὑπαντ.*, and others are often occurring: I count all places where one of the primary authorities has *εἰς ἀπ.* with gen. or dat. representing ``ל. In addition there are a few places where the phrase answers to a different original; also 1 ex. with gen. and 3 with dat. from the Apocrypha.) Luke (Ac 28^{15}) uses it with dat., and in Mt 25^{6} it appears absolutely, as once in LXX (1 Sa 13^{15}). Now this last may be directly paralleled in a Ptolemaic papyrus which certainly has no Semitism —Tb P 43 (ii/B.C.) *παρεγενήθημεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν* (a newly arriving magistrate). In BU 362 (215 A.D.) *πρὸς [ἀ]πάντη[σιν τοῦ]ἡγεμόνος* has the very gen. we want. One of Strack's Ptolemaic inscriptions (*Archiv* iii. 129) has *ἵν' εἰδῆι ἣν ἔσχηκεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ πόλις εὐχάριστον ἀπάντησιν.* It seems that the special idea of the word was the official welcome of a newly arrived dignitary—an idea singularly in place in the NT exx. The case after it is entirely consistent with Greek idiom, the gen. as in our "to *his* inauguration," the dat. as the case governed by the verb. If in the LXX the use has been extended, it is only because it seemed so literal a translation of the Hebrew. Note that in 1 Th *l.c.* the authorities of the δ-text read the dat., which is I suspect better Greek. (What has been said applies also to *εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ*, as in Mt 8^{34}, Jn 12^{13}: the two words seem synonymous). See also p. 242.

Passing on to Dalman's (*b*) class, in which Luke is concerned equally with the other Synoptists, we may observe that only a very free translation would drop these pleonasms. In a sense they are "meaningless," just as the first verb is in "He *went* and did it all the same," or "He *got up* and went out," or (purposely to take a parallel from the vernacular) "So he ups and says." But however little additional information they may add—and for us at least the "*stand* praying" is not a superfluous touch—they add a distinct *nuance* to the whole phrase, which Luke was not likely to sacrifice when he met it in his translation or heard it from the *αὐτόπται* whose story he was jotting down. The same may be said of the pleonastic phrases which begin and end Dalman's list of "pure Hebraisms." In this class (*c*) therefore there remains only the construction with *καὶ ἐγένετο*, answering to the narrative וַיְהִי, which is (strangely enough) almost peculiar to Luke in the NT. There are three constructions:—(*a*) *ἐγένετο ἦλθε*, (*b*) *ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε*, (*c*) *ἐγένετο (αὐτὸν) ἐλθεῖν*.[1] The occurrences of these respectively are for Lk 22/11/5, for Ac 0/0/17.[2] It may be added that the construction occurs almost always with a time clause (generally with *ἐν*): in Lk there is only one exception, 16^{22}. The phrase was clearly therefore temporal originally, like our "It was in the days of . . . that . . ." (This is (*c*), but we could use the paratactic (*a*) form, or even (*b*), without transgressing our idiom.) Driver (*Tenses*, § 78) describes the וַיְהִי construction as occurring when there is inserted "a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place,"—a description which will suit the Lucan usage everywhere, except sometimes in the (*c*) class (as 16^{22}), the only one of the three which has no Hebrew parallel. We must infer that the LXX translators used this locution as a just tolerable Greek which literally represented the original;[3] and that Lk (and to a minute extent Mt and Mk) deliberately recalled the Greek OT by using the phrase. The (*a*) form is used elsewhere in the NT twice in Mk and five times in Mt, only in the phrase *ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κτλ.* Mt 9^{10} has (*b*) and Mk 2^{23} has (*c*). There are (*a*) forms with *ἔσται* Ac $2^{17.21}$ 3^{23}, Rom 9^{26} (all OT citations); and (*c*) forms with *γίνεται* Mk 2^{15},

---

[1] But see E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* ii. 487. Harnack (*Sayings*, p. 2) cites my view without approving it. I cannot resist the conviction that Harnack greatly overpresses his doctrine of Luke's stylistic alterations of Q.

[2] Luke "probably did not understand Aramaic," says Jülicher, *Introd.* 359. So Dalman, *Words* 38–41. Harnack (*Luke*, pp. 102 f.) observes that in ch. 1 and 2 Luke either himself translated from Aramaic sources or very freely adapted oral materials to literary form. He prefers the second alternative.

---

[1] Once (Ac 10^{25}), *ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον.*

[2] Blass cites Ac 4^{5} D for (*a*), and finds (*b*) in 5^{7}. Certainly the latter sentence may be thus construed (see below, p. 70); nor is it a fatal objection that the construction is otherwise isolated in Ac. See p. 233.

[3] W. F. Moulton (WM 760 n.) gives LXX exx. for the (*a*) and (*b*) forms: the only approach to the (*c*) form is 2 Mac 3^{16}, *ἦν . . . ὁρῶντα . . . τιτρώσκεσθαι.* Here Mr Thackeray thinks *ἦν* = *ἔδει*, "it was impossible not to . . ."

ἐὰν γένηται Mt 18^{13}, and *ὅπως μὴ γένηται* Ac 20^{16}. Now in what sense is any of this to be called "Hebraism"? It is obvious that (*b*) is a literal translation of the Hebrew, while it is at least grammatical as Greek, however unidiomatic. Its retention to a limited extent in Lk (with a single doubtful case in Ac), and absence elsewhere in NT (except for Mt 9^{10}, which is affected by the author's love for *καὶ ἰδού*), are best interpreted as meaning that in free Greek it was rather an experiment, other constructions being preferred even by a writer who set himself to copy the LXX style. At first sight (*a*) would seem worse Greek still, but we must note that it is apparently known in MGr:[1] cf Pallis's version of Mt 11^{1}, *καὶ συνέβηκε, σὰν τέλιωσε . . ., ἔφυγε . . .*, etc. We cannot suppose that this is an invasion of Biblical Greek, any more than our own idiomatic "It happened I was at home that day." What then of (*c*), which is characteristic of Luke, and adopted by him in Ac as an exclusive substitute for the other two? It starts from Greek vernacular, beyond doubt. The normal Greek *συνέβη* still takes what represents the *acc. et inf.*: *συνέβη ὅτι ἦρθε* is idiomatic in modern Athenian speech, against *ἔτυχε νὰ ἔλθῃ* which, I am told, is commoner in the country districts. But *ἐὰν γένηται* with inf. was good contemporary vernacular: see AP 135, BM 970, and *Pap. Catt.* (in *Archiv* iii. 60)—all ii/A.D. So was *γίνεται* (as Mk 2^{15}): cf Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) *γίνεται γὰρ ἐντραπῆναι*. From this to *ἐγένετο* is but a step, which Luke alone of NT writers seems to have taken:[2] the isolated ex. in Mk 2^{23} is perhaps a primitive assimilation to Lk 6^{1}.[3]

---

[1] Cf Thumb, *Hellenismus* 123: "What appears Hebraism or Aramaism in the Bible must count as Greek if it shows itself as a natural development in the MGr vernacular." Mr Thackeray well compares asyndeta like *καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψεις* in the papyri.

[2] An interesting suggestion is made by Prof. B. W. Bacon in *Expos.*, April 1905, p. 174 n., who thinks that the "Semitism" may be taken over from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." The secondary character of this Gospel, as judged from the extant fragments, has been sufficiently proved by Dr Adeney (*Hibbert Journal*, iii. pp. 139 ff.); but this does not prevent our positing an earlier and purer form as one of Luke's sources. Bacon's quotation for this is after the (*a*) form: "*Factum est* autem, cum ascendisset . . ., *descendit* . . ." (No. 4 in Preuschen's collection, *Antilegomena*, p. 4). The (*a*) form occurs in frag. 2 of the "Ebionite Gospel" (Preuschen, p. 9).

[3] *Παραπορεύεσθαι* (ℵALΔ *al*) may be a relic of Mk's original text.

Conclusions as to Semitism.

By this time we have perhaps dealt sufficiently with the principles involved, and may leave details of alleged Semitisms to their proper places in the grammar. We have seen that the problem is only complicated in the Lucan writings: elsewhere we have either pure vernacular or vernacular tempered with "translation Greek." In Luke, the only NT writer except the author of Heb to show any conscious attention to Greek ideas of style, we find (1) rough Greek translations from Aramaic left mainly as they reached him, perhaps because their very roughness seemed too characteristic to be refined away; and (2) a very limited imitation of the LXX idiom, as specially appropriate while the story moves in the Jewish world. The conscious adaptation of his own style to that of sacred writings long current among his readers reminds us of the rule which restricted our nineteenth century Biblical Revisers to the English of the Elizabethan age.

On the whole question, Thumb (p. 122) quotes with approval Deissmann's dictum that "Semitisms which are in common use belong mostly to the technical language of religion," like that of our sermons and Sunday magazines. Such Semitisms "alter the scientific description of the language as little as did a few Latinisms, or other booty from the victorious march of Greek over the world around the Mediterranean."[1] In summing up thus the issue of the long strife over NT Hebraisms, we fully apprehend the danger of going too far. Semitic thought, whose native literary dress was necessarily foreign to the Hellenic genius, was bound to fall sometimes into un-Hellenic language as well as style. Moreover, if Deissmann has brought us a long way, we must not forget the complementary researches of Dalman, which have opened up a new world of possibilities in the scientific reconstruction of Aramaic originals, and have warned us of the importance of distinguishing very carefully between Semitisms from two widely different sources. What we can assert with assurance is that the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of a NT Greek which in any material respect differed from that spoken by ordinary people in daily life throughout the Roman world. If the natural objection is raised that there must have been dialectic variation where people of very different races, scattered over an immense area, were learning the world language, and that "Jewish-Greek" is thus made an *a priori* certainty, we can meet the difficulty with a tolerably complete modern parallel. Our own language is to-day spoken over a far vaster area; and we have only to ask to what extent dialect difference affects the modern *Weltsprache.* We find that pronunciation and vocabulary exhaust between them nearly all the phenomena we could catalogue. Englishman, Welshman, Hindu, Colonial, granted a tolerable primary education, can interchange familiar letters without betraying except in trifles the dialect of their daily speech.[a] This fact should help us to realise how few local peculiarities can be expected to show themselves at such an interval in a language known to us solely from writing. We may add that a highly educated speaker of standard English, recognisable by his intonation as hailing from London, Edinburgh, or New York, can no longer thus be recognised when his words are written down. The comparison will help us to realise the impression made by the traveller Paul.

---

[1] Art. *Hellenistisches Griechisch*, in *RE*^{3} vii. p. 638.

[[a] See p. 243.

A special NT diction?

There is one general consideration which must detain us a little at the close of this introductory chapter. Those who have studied some recent work upon Hellenistic Greek, such as Blass's brilliant *Grammar of NT Greek*, will probably be led to feel that modern methods result in a considerable levelling of distinctions, grammatical and lexical, on which the exegesis of the past has laid great stress. It seems necessary therefore at the outset to put in a plea for caution, lest an exaggerated view should be taken of the extent to which our new lights alter our conceptions of the NT language and its interpretation. We have been showing that the NT writers used the language of their time. But that does not mean that they had not in a very real sense a language of their own. Specific examples in which we feel bound to assert this for them will come up from time to time in our inquiry. In the light of the papyri and of MGr we are compelled to give up some grammatical scruples which figure largely in great commentators like Westcott, and colour many passages of the RV. But it does not follow that we must promptly obliterate every grammatical distinction that proves to have been unfamiliar to the daily conversation of the first century Egyptian farmer. We are in no danger now of reviving Hatch's idea that phrases which could translate the same Hebrew must be equivalent to one another. The papyri have slain this very Euclid-like axiom, but they must not enslave us to others as dangerous. The NT must still be studied largely by light drawn from itself. Books written on the same subject and within the same circle must always gather some amount of identical style or idiom, a kind of technical terminology, which may often preserve a usage of earlier language, obsolescent because not needed in more slovenly colloquial speech of the same time. The various conservatisms of our own religious dialect, even on the lips of uneducated people, may serve as a parallel up to a certain point. The comparative correctness and dignity of speech to which an unlettered man will rise in prayer, is a very familiar phenomenon, lending strong support to the expectation that even *ἀγράμματοι* would instinctively rise above their usual level of exactness in expression, when dealing with such high themes as those which fill the NT. We are justified by these considerations in examining each NT writer's language first by itself, and then in connexion with that of his fellow-contributors to the sacred volume; and we may allow ourselves to retain the original force of distinctions which were dying or dead in every-day parlance, when there is a sufficient body of internal evidence. Of course we shall not be tempted to use this argument when the whole of our evidence denies a particular survival to Hellenistic vernacular: in such a case we could only find the locution as a definite literary revival, rarely possible in Luke and the writer to the Hebrews, and just conceivable in Paul.

Note on Latinisms.

It seems hardly worth while to discuss in a general way the supposition that Latin has influenced the *Κοινή* of the NT. In the borrowing of Latin words of course we can see activity enough, and there are even phrases literally translated, like *λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανόν* Ac 17^{9}; *ποιεῖν τὸ ἱ.* Mk 15^{15} (as early as

Polybius); *μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας* Ac 1^5, etc. But grammar we must regard as another matter, in spite of such collections as Buttmann's (see his Index, *s.v. Latinisms*) or Thayer's (Hastings' *DB* iii. 40). It will suffice to refer to Prof. Thumb's judgement (*Hellenismus* 152 ff.). Romans writing Greek might be expected to have difficulties for example with the article[1]—as I have noticed in the English efforts of Japanese boys at school in this country; but even of this there seems to be no very decisive proof. And though the bulk of the NT comes to us from authors with Roman names, no one will care to assert that Latin was the native language of Paul[2] or Luke or Mark. Apart from lexical matters, we may be content with a general negative. "Of any effective *grammatical* influence [of Latin] upon Greek there can be no question: at any rate I know nothing which could be instanced to this effect with any probability." So says Dr Thumb, and the justification of his decision in each alleged example may be safely left till the cases arise. It should of course be noted that Prof. Blass (p. 4) is rather more disposed to admit Latinisms in syntax. Greek and Latin were so constantly in contact throughout the history of the *Κοινή*, that the question of Latinisms in Greek or Graecisms in Latin must often turn largely on general impressions of the genius of each language.[3]

---

[1] Foreigners sometimes did find the article a stumbling block: witness the long inscription of Antiochus I of Commagene, *OGIS* 383 (i/B.C.)—see Dittenberger's notes on p. 596 (vol. i.). We may here quote the lamented epigraphist's note, on *Syll.*² 930 (p. 785), that a translator from Latin might fall into a confusion between *τίς* and *ὅς*. In a linguist who can render *quo minus* by *ᾧ ἔλασσον* (l. 57), we take such a mistake as a matter of course; yet we shall see (p. 93) that its occurrence is very far from convicting a document of Latinising.

[2] This does not involve denying that Paul could speak Latin; see p. 233.

[3] How inextricably bound together were the fortunes of Greek and Latin in the centuries following our era, is well shown in W. Schulze's pamphlet, *Graeca Latina*. He does not, I think, prove any real action of Latin on Greek early enough to affect the NT, except for some mere trifles. Brugmann (*Dist.* p. 9), discussing the idiom *δύο δύο* (see below, p. 97), speaks of the theory of Semitism and Thumb's denial of it, and proceeds: "The truth lies between the two, as it does in many similar cases—I am thinking among others of Graecisms in Latin, and of Latinisms and Gallicisms in German. A locution already in existence in Greek popular language, side by side with other forms (*ἀνὰ δύο*, *κατὰ δύο*), received new strength and wider circulation through the similar Hebrew expression as it became known." I welcome such a confirmation of my thesis from the acknowledged master of our craft.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE "COMMON" GREEK.

A New Study. WE proceed to examine the nature and history of the vernacular Greek itself. This is a study which has almost come into existence in the present generation. Classical scholars have studied the Hellenistic literature for the sake of its matter: its language was seldom considered worth noticing, except to chronicle contemptuously its deviations from "good Greek." In so suffering, perhaps the authors only received the treatment they deserved; for to write Attic was the object of them all, pursued doubtless with varying degrees of zeal, but in all cases removing them far from the language they used in daily life. The pure study of the vernacular was hardly possible, for the Biblical Greek was interpreted on lines of its own, and the papyri were mostly reposing in their Egyptian tombs, the collections that were published receiving but little attention. (Cf above, p. 7 n.) Equally unknown was the scientific study of modern Greek. To this day, even great philologists like Hatzidakis decry as a mere patois, utterly unfit for literary use, the living language upon whose history they have spent their lives. The translation of the Gospels into the Greek which descends directly from their original idiom, is treated as sacrilege by the devotees of a "literary" dialect which, in point of fact, no one ever spoke! It is left to foreigners to recognise the value of Pallis's version for students who seek to understand NT Greek in the light of the continuous development of the language from the age of Alexander to our own time. See p. 243.

The Sources. As has been hinted in the preceding paragraph, the materials for our present-day study of NT Greek are threefold:—(1) the prose literature of the post-classical period, from Polybius down, and including the LXX; (2) the *Κοινή* inscriptions, and the Egyptian non-literary papyri; (3) modern vernacular Greek, with especial reference to its dialectic variations, so far as these are at present registered. Before we discuss the part which each of these must play in our investigations, it will be necessary to ask what was the *Κοινή* and how it arose. We should premise that we use the name here as a convenient term for the spoken dialect of the period under review, using "literary *Κοινή*" and similar terms when the dialect of Polybius, Josephus, and the rest, is referred to. Whether this is the ancient use of the name we need not stay to examine:[a] the curious will find a paper on the subject by Prof. Jannaris in *CR* xvii. 93 ff., which may perhaps prove that he and we have misused the ancient grammarians' phraseology. *Οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ.*

[[a] See p. 243.

Greek and its Dialects.

The history, geography, and ethnology of Hellas are jointly responsible for the remarkable phenomena which even the literature of the classical period presents. The very schoolboy in his first two or three years at Greek has to realise that "Greek" is anything but a unity. He has not thumbed the *Anabasis* long before the merciful pedagogue takes him on to Homer, and his painfully acquired irregular verbs demand a great extension of their limits. When he develops into a Tripos candidate, he knows well that Homer, Pindar, Sappho, Herodotus and Aristotle are all of them in their several ways defiant of the Attic grammar to which his own composition must conform. And if his studies ultimately invade the dialect inscriptions,[1] he finds in Elis and Heraclea, Lacedaemon and Thebes, Crete[2] and Cyprus, forms of Greek for which his literature has almost entirely failed to prepare him. Yet the Theban who said *Ϝίττω Δεύς* and the Athenian with his *ἴστω Ζεύς* lived in towns exactly as far apart as Liverpool and Manchester! The bewildering variety of dialects within that little country arises partly from racial differences. Upon the indigenous population, represented best (it would seem) by the Athenians of history, swept first from Northern Europe[1] the hordes of Homer's Achæans, and then, in post-Homeric days, the Dorian invaders. Dialectic conditions were as inevitably complex as they became in our own country a thousand years ago, when successive waves of Germanic invaders, of different tribes and dialects, had settled in the several parts of an island in which a Keltic population still maintained itself to greater or less extent. Had the Norman Conquest come before the Saxon, which determined the language of the country, the parallel would have been singularly complete. The conditions which in England were largely supplied by distance, were supplied in Greece by the mountain barriers which so effectively cut off each little State from regular communication with its neighbours—an effect and a cause at once of the passion for autonomy which made of Hellas a heptarchy of heptarchies.

---

[1] An extremely convenient little selection of dialect inscriptions is now available in the Teubner series:—*Inscriptiones Graecae ad inlustrandas Dialectos selectae*, by Felix Solmsen. The book has less than 100 pp., but its contents might be relied on to perplex very tolerable scholars!

[2] See p. 233.

Survival of the Fittest.

Meanwhile, a steady process was going on which determined finally the character of literary Greek. Sparta might win the hegemony of Greece at Aegospotami, and Thebes wrest it from her at Leuktra. But Sparta could not produce a man of letters,—Alkman (who was not a Spartan!) will serve as the exception that proves the rule; and Pindar, the lonely "Theban eagle," knew better than to try poetic flights in Bœotian. The intellectual supremacy of Athens was beyond challenge long before the political unification of Greece was accomplished; and Attic was firmly established as the only possible dialect for prose composition. The post-classical writers wrote Attic according to their lights, tempered generally with a plentiful admixture of grammatical and lexical elements drawn from the vernacular for which they had too hearty a contempt even to give it a name. Strenuous efforts were made by precisians to improve the Attic quality of this artificial literary dialect; and we still possess the works of Atticists who cry out against the "bad Greek" and "solecisms" of their contemporaries, thus incidentally providing us with information concerning a Greek which interests us more than the artificial Attic they prized so highly. All their scrupulousness did not however prevent their deviating from Attic in matters more important than vocabulary. The optative in Lucian is perpetually misused, and no Atticist successfully attempts to reproduce the ancient use of *οὐ* and *μή* with the participle. Those writers who are less particular in their purism write in a literary *Κοινή* which admits without difficulty many features of various origin, while generally recalling Attic. No doubt the influence of Thucydides encouraged this freedom. The true Attic, as spoken by educated people in Athens, was hardly used in literature before iv/B.C.;[1] while the Ionic dialect had largely influenced the somewhat artificial idiom which the older writers at Athens used. It was not strange therefore that the standard for most of the post-classical writers should go back, for instance, to the *πράσσω* of Thucydides rather than the *πράττω* of Plato and Demosthenes.

---

[1] I am assuming as proved the thesis of Prof. Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece*, which seems to me a key that will unlock many problems of Greek history, religion, and language. Of course *adhuc sub iudice lis est* and with Prof. Thumb on the other side I should be sorry to dogmatise.

Literary Κοινή.

Such, then, was the "Common Greek" of literature, from which we have still to derive our illustrations for the NT to a very large extent. Any lexicon will show how important for our purpose is the vocabulary of the *Κοινή* writers, from Polybius down. And even the most rigid Atticists found themselves unable to avoid words and usages which Plato would not have recognised. But side by side with this was a fondness for obsolete words with literary associations. Take *ναῦς*, for example, which is freely found in Aelian, Josephus, and other *Κοινή* writers. It does not appear in the indices of eight volumes of Grenfell and Hunt's papyri—except where literary fragments come in,—nor in those to vol. iii of the Berlin collection and the small volume from Chicago. (I am naming all the collections that I happen to have by me.[2]) We turn to the NT and find it once, and that is in Luke's shipwreck narrative, in a phrase which Blass (*Philology* 186) suspects to be a reminiscence of Homer. In style and syntax the literary Common Greek diverges more widely from the colloquial. The bearing of all this on the subject of our study will come out frequently in the course of our investigations. Here it will suffice to refer to Blass, p. 5, for an interesting summary of phenomena which are practically restricted to the author of Heb, and to parts of Luke and Paul, where sundry lexical and grammatical elements from the literary dialect invade the colloquial style which is elsewhere universal in the NT.[1]

---

[1] Schwyzer, *Die Weltsprachen des Altertums*, p. 15 n., cites as the earliest extant prose monument of genuine Attic in literature, the pseudo-Xenophon's *De republica Atheniensi*, which dates from before 413 B.C.

[2] In 1905.

Modern "Attic."

The writers who figure in Dr W. Schmid's well-known book, *Der Atticismus*, were not the last to found a literary language on the artificial resuscitation of the ancient Attic. Essentially the same thing is being tried in our time. "The purists of to-day," says Thumb (*Hellenismus* 180), "are like the old Atticists to a hair." Their "mummy-language," as Krumbacher calls it, will not stand the test of use in poetry; but in prose literature, in newspapers, and in Biblical translation, it has the dominion, which is vindicated by Athenian undergraduates with bloodshed if need be.[2] We have nothing to do with this curious phenomenon, except to warn students that before citing MGr in illustration of the NT, they must make sure whether their source is *καθαρεύουσα* or *ὁμιλουμένη*, book Greek or spoken Greek. The former may of course have borrowed from ancient or modern sources—for it is a medley far more mixed than we should get by compounding together Cynewulf and Kipling—the particular feature for which it is cited. But it obviously cannot stand in any line of historical development, and it is just as valuable as Volapük to the student of linguistic evolution. The popular patois, on the other hand, is a living language, and we shall soon see that it takes a very important part in the discussions on which we are entering.

---

[1] For literary elements in NT writers, see especially E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* ii. 482 ff. In the paragraph above referred to, Blass suggests that in Ac 20^{29} Luke *misused* the literary word ἄφιξις. If so, he hardly sinned alone: cf the citations in Grimm-Thayer, which are at least ambiguous, and add Jos. *Ant.* ii. 18 *fin.* μὴ προδηλώσαντες τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ἐκεῖσε ἄφιξιν, where *departure* seems certain. See our note *sub voce* in *Expositor* vii. vi. 376. The meaning "my *home-coming*" is hardly likely.

[2] See Krumbacher's vigorous polemic, *Das Problem d. neugr. Schriftsprache*, summarised by the present writer in *Exp T* xiv. 550 ff. Hatzidakis replies with equal energy in *REGr*, 1903, pp. 210 ff., and further in an Ἀπάντησις (1905).

First Century Κοινή: Sources.

We pass on then to the spoken dialect of the first century Hellenists, its history and its peculiarities. Our sources are, in order of importance, (1) non-literary papyri, (2) inscriptions, (3) modern vernacular Greek. The literary sources are almost confined to the Biblical Greek. A few general words may be said on these sources, before we examine the origin of the Greek which they embody.

(1) Papyri.

The papyri have one very obvious disadvantage, in that, with the not very important exception of Herculaneum,[1] their provenance is limited to one country, Egypt. We shall see, however, that the disadvantage does not practically count. They date from 311 B.C. to vii/A.D. The monuments of the earliest period are fairly abundant, and they give us specimens of the spoken *Κοινή* from a time when the dialect was still a novelty. The papyri, to be sure, are not to be treated as a unity. Those which alone concern us come from the tombs and waste paper heaps of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt; and their style has the same degree of unity as we should see in the contents of the sacks of waste paper sent to an English paper-mill from a solicitor's office, a farm, a school, a shop, a manse, and a house in Downing Street. Each contribution has to be considered separately. Wills, law-reports, contracts, census-returns, marriage-settlements, receipts and official orders largely ran along stereotyped lines; and, as formulæ tend to be permanent, we have a degree of conservatism in the language which is not seen in documents free from these trammels. Petitions contain this element in greater or less extent, but naturally show more freedom in the recitation of the particular grievances for which redress is claimed. Private letters are our most valuable sources; and they are all the better for the immense differences that betray themselves in the education of their writers. The well-worn epistolary formulæ show variety mostly in their spelling; and their value for the student lies primarily in their remarkable resemblances to the conventional phraseology which even the NT letter-writers were content to use.[1] That part of the letter which is free from formulæ is perhaps most instructive when its grammar is weakest, for it shows which way the language was tending. Few papyri are more suggestive than the letter of the lower-school-boy to his father, OP 119 (ii/iii A.D.). It would have surprised Theon *père*, when he applied the well-merited cane, to learn that seventeen centuries afterwards there might be scholars who would count his boy's audacious missive greater treasure than a new fragment of Sappho! But this is by the way. It must not be inferred from our laudation of the ungrammatical papyri that the NT writers are at all comparable to these scribes in lack of education. The indifference to concord, which we noted in Rev, is almost isolated in this connexion. But the illiterates show us by their exaggerations the tendencies which the better schooled writers keep in restraint. With writings from farmers and from emperors, and every class between, we can form a kind of "grammatometer" by which to estimate how the language stands in the development of any particular use we may wish to investigate.

---

[1] On these see the monumental work of W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Teubner, 1903); also E. L. Hicks in *CR* i. 186.

(2) Inscriptions. Inscriptions come second to papyri, in this connexion, mainly because their very material shows that they were meant to last. Their Greek may not be of the purest; but we see it, such as it is, in its best clothes, while that of the papyri is in corduroys. The special value of the Common Greek inscriptions lies in their corroborating the papyri, for they practically show that there was but little dialectic difference between the Greek of Egypt and that of Asia Minor, Italy, and Syria. There would probably be varieties of pronunciation, and we have evidence that districts differed in their preferences among sundry equivalent locutions; but a speaker of Greek would be understood without the slightest difficulty wherever he went throughout the immense area over which the Greek world-speech reigned. With the *caveat* already implied, that inscription-Greek may contain literary elements which are absent from an unstudied private letter, we may use without misgiving the immense and ever-growing collections of later Greek epigraphy. How much may be made of them is well seen in the *Preisschrift* of Dr E. Schwyzer,[1] *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften*, an invaluable guide to the accidence of the *Κοινή*. (It has been followed up by E. Nachmanson in his *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften* (1903), which does the same work, section by section, for the *corpus* from Magnesia.) Next to the papyrus collections, there is no tool the student of the NT ***Κοινή*** will find so useful as a book of late inscriptions, such as Dittenberger's *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones selectae*, or the larger part of his *Sylloge* (ed. 2).

---

[1] On this point see Deissmann, *BS* 21 ff. ; J. R. Harris, in *Expos.* v. viii. 161 ff. ; G. G. Findlay, *Thess.* (*CGT*), lxi. ; Robinson, *Eph.* 275–284.

(3) Modern Greek.

Finally we have MGr to bring in.[2] The discovery that the vernacular of to-day goes back historically to the *Κοινή* was made in 1834 by Heilmaier, in a book on the origin of the "Romaic." This discovery once established, it became clear that we could work back from MGr to reconstruct the otherwise imperfectly known oral Greek of the Hellenistic age.[3] It is however only in the last generation that the importance of this method has been adequately recognised. We had not indeed till recently acquired trustworthy materials. Mullach's grammar, upon which the editor of Winer had to depend for one of the most fruitful innovations of his work,[4] started from wrong premisses as to the relation between the old language and the new.[5] We have now, in such books themselves in the education of their writers. The well-worn epistolary formulæ show variety mostly in their spelling; and their value for the student lies primarily in their remarkable resemblances to the conventional phraseology which even the NT letter-writers were content to use.[1] That part of the letter which is free from formulæ is perhaps most instructive when its grammar is weakest, for it shows which way the language was tending. Few papyri are more suggestive than the letter of the lower-school-boy to his father, OP 119 (ii/iii A.D.). It would have surprised Theon *père*, when he applied the well-merited cane, to learn that seventeen centuries afterwards there might be scholars who would count his boy's audacious missive greater treasure than a new fragment of Sappho! But this is by the way. It must not be inferred from our laudation of the ungrammatical papyri that the NT writers are at all comparable to these scribes in lack of education. The indifference to concord, which we noted in Rev, is almost isolated in this connexion. But the illiterates show us by their exaggerations the tendencies which the better schooled writers keep in restraint. With writings from farmers and from emperors, and every class between, we can form a kind of "grammatometer" by which to estimate how the language stands in the development of any particular use we may wish to investigate.

---

[1] He was Schweizer in 1898, when this book was published, but has changed since, to our confusion. He has edited Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, and written the interesting lecture on *Die Weltsprache* named above.

[2] I must enter here a caveat as to the use of G. F. Abbott's charming little volume, *Songs of Modern Greece*, as a source for scientific purposes. Prof. Psichari and Dr Rouse show me that I have trusted it too much.

[3] I cite from Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der* Κοινή, p. 4.

[4] Cf WM index *s.v.* "Greek (modern)," p. 824.

[5] Cf Krumbacher in *KZ* xxvii. 488. Krumbacher uses the epithet "dilettante" about Mullach, *ib.* p. 497, but rather (I fancy) for his theories than his facts. After all, Mullach came too early to be blameworthy for his unscientific position.

(2) Inscriptions. Inscriptions come second to papyri, in this connexion, mainly because their very material shows that they were meant to last. Their Greek may not be of the purest; but we see it, such as it is, in its best clothes, while that of the papyri is in corduroys. The special value of the Common Greek inscriptions lies in their corroborating the papyri, for they practically show that there was but little dialectic difference between the Greek of Egypt and that of Asia Minor, Italy, and Syria. There would probably be varieties of pronunciation, and we have evidence that districts differed in their preferences among sundry equivalent locutions; but a speaker of Greek would be understood without the slightest difficulty wherever he went throughout the immense area over which the Greek world-speech reigned. With the *caveat* already implied, that inscription-Greek may contain literary elements which are absent from an unstudied private letter, we may use without misgiving the immense and ever-growing collections of later Greek epigraphy. How much may be made of them is well seen in the *Preisschrift* of Dr E. Schwyzer,[1] *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften*, an invaluable guide to the accidence of the *Κοινή*. (It has been followed up by E. Nachmanson in his *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften* (1903), which does the same work, section by section, for the *corpus* from Magnesia.) Next to the papyrus collections, there is no tool the student of the NT ***Κοινή*** will find so useful as a book of late inscriptions, such as Dittenberger's *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones selectae*, or the larger part of his *Sylloge* (ed. ^{2}).

---

[1] On this point see Deissmann, *BS* 21 ff.; J. R. Harris, in *Expos.* v. viii. 161 ff.; G. G. Findlay, *Thess.* (*CGT*), lxi.; Robinson, *Eph.* 275–284.

(3) Modern Greek.

Finally we have MGr to bring in.[2] The discovery that the vernacular of to-day goes back historically to the *Κοινή* was made in 1834 by Heilmaier, in a book on the origin of the "Romaic." This discovery once established, it became clear that we could work back from MGr to reconstruct the otherwise imperfectly known oral Greek of the Hellenistic age.[3] It is however only in the last generation that the importance of this method has been adequately recognised. We had not indeed till recently acquired trustworthy materials. Mullach's grammar, upon which the editor of Winer had to depend for one of the most fruitful innovations of his work,[4] started from wrong premisses as to the relation between the old language and the new.[5] We have now, in such books as Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* and Hatzidakis's *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, the means of checking not a few statements about MGr which were really based on the artificial Greek of the schools. The perpetual references to the NT in the latter work will indicate forcibly how many of the developments of modern vernacular had their roots in that of two thousand years ago. The gulf between the ancient and the modern is bridged by the material collected and arranged by Jannaris in his *Historical Greek Grammar*. The study of a Gospel in the vernacular version of Pallis[1] will at first produce the impression that the gulf is very wide indeed; but the strong points of contact will become very evident in time. Hatzidakis indeed even goes so far as to assert that "the language generally spoken to-day in the towns differs less from the common language of Polybius than this last differs from the language of Homer."[2]

---

[1] He was Schweizer in 1898, when this book was published, but has changed since, to our confusion. He has edited Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*^{3}, and written the interesting lecture on *Die Weltsprache* named above.

[2] I must enter here a caveat as to the use of G. F. Abbott's charming little volume, *Songs of Modern Greece*, as a source for scientific purposes. Prof. Psichari and Dr Rouse show me that I have trusted it too much.

[3] I cite from Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der* Κοινή, p. 4.

[4] Cf WM index *s.v.* "Greek (modern)," p. 824.

[5] Cf Krumbacher in *KZ* xxvii. 488. Krumbacher uses the epithet "dilettante" about Mullach, *ib.* p. 497, but rather (I fancy) for his theories than his facts. After all, Mullach came too early to be blameworthy for his unscientific position.

The Birth of the Κοινή.

We are now ready to enquire how this Common Greek of the NT rose out of the classical language. Some features of its development are undoubted, and may be noted first. The impulse which produced it lay, beyond question, in the work of Alexander the Great. The unification of Hellas was a necessary first step in the accomplishment of his dream of Hellenising the world which he had marked out for conquest. To achieve unity of speech throughout the little country which his father's diplomatic and military triumphs had virtually conquered for him, was a task too serious for Alexander himself to face. But unconsciously he effected this, as a by-product of his colossal achievement; and the next generation found that not only had a common language emerged from the chaos of Hellenic dialects, but a new and nearly homogeneous world-speech had been created, in which Persian and Egyptian might do business together, and Roman proconsuls issue their commands to the subjects of a mightier empire than Alexander's own. His army was in itself a powerful agent in the levelling process which ultimately destroyed nearly all the Greek dialects. The Anabasis of the Ten Thousand Greeks, seventy years before, had doubtless produced results of the same kind on a small scale. Clearchus the Lacedaemonian, Menon the Thessalian, Socrates the Arcadian, Proxenus the Bœotian, and the rest, would find it difficult to preserve their native brogue very long free from the solvent influences of perpetual association during their march; and when Cheirisophus of Sparta and Xenophon of Athens had safely brought the host home, it is not strange that the historian himself had suffered in the purity of his Attic, which has some peculiarities distinctly foreshadowing the *Κοινή*.[1] The assimilating process would go much further in the camp of Alexander, where, during prolonged campaigns, men from all parts of Greece were tent-fellows and messmates, with no choice but to accommodate their mode of speech in its more individual characteristics to the average Greek which was gradually being evolved among their comrades. In this process naturally those features which were peculiar to a single dialect would have the smallest chance of surviving, and those which most successfully combined the characteristics of many dialects would be surest of a place in the resultant "common speech." The army by itself only furnished a nucleus for the new growth. As Hellenism swept victoriously into Asia, and established itself on all the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, the mixture of nationalities in the new-rising communities demanded a common language as the medium of intercourse, and the Greek of the victorious armies of Alexander was ready for the purpose. In the country districts of the motherland, the old dialects lived on for generations; but by this time Greece herself was only one factor in the great Hellenising movement to which the world was to owe so much. Besides, the dialects which strikingly differed from the new *Κοινή* were spoken by races that mostly lay outside the movement. History gives an almost pathetic interest to an inscription like that from Larissa (Michel 41—end of iii/B.C.), where the citizens record a rescript from King Philip V, and their own consequent resolutions:—

---

[1] Ἡ *Νέα Διαθήκη, μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν* Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη (Liverpool, 1902). (Pallis has now translated the *Iliad*, and even some of Kant—with striking success, in Thumb's opinion, *DLZ*, 1905, pp. 2084–6.) Unfortunately the B.F.B.S. version contains so much of the artificial Greek that it is beyond the comprehension of the common people: the bitter prejudice of the educated classes at present has closed the door even to this, much more to Pallis's version.

[2] *REGr*, 1903, p. 220. (See a further note below, pp. 233f.)

---

[1] Cf Rutherford, *NP* 160–174. The same may be said of the language of the lower classes in Athens herself in v/B.C., consisting as they did of immigrants from all parts. So [Xenophon] *Constitution of Athens* 11. 3 :—"The Greeks have an individual dialect, and manner of life and fashion of their own; but the Athenians have what is compounded from all the Greeks and barbarians." The vase-inscriptions abundantly evidence this. (Kretschmer, *Entstehung d.* Κοινή, p. 34.) The importance of Xenophon as a forerunner of Hellenism is well brought out by Mahaffy, *Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*, Lecture i.

Ταγευόντουν ʼΑναγκίπποι Πετθαλείοι κ.τ.λ., Φιλίπποι τοῖ βασιλεῖος ἐπιστολὰν ἀπυστέλλαντος πὸτ τὸς ταγὸς καὶ τὰν πόλιν τὰν ὑπογεγραμμέναν·

Βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος Λαρισαίων τοῖς ταγοῖς καὶ τῆι πόλει χαίρειν (and so on in normal *Κοινή*).

Decay of the Dialects.

The old and the new survived thus side by side into the imperial age; but Christianity had only a brief opportunity of speaking in the old dialects of Greece. In one corner of Hellas alone did the dialect live on. To-day scholars recognise a single modern idiom, the Zaconian, which does not directly descend from the *Κοινή*. As we might expect, this is nothing but the ancient Laconian, whose broad *ᾱ* holds its ground still in the speech of a race impervious to literature and proudly conservative of a language that was always abnormal to an extreme. Apart from this the dialects died out entirely.[a] They contributed their share to the resultant Common Greek; but it is an assured result of MGr philology that there are no elements of speech whatever now existing, due to the ancient dialects, which did not find their way into the stream of development through the channel of the vernacular *Κοινή* of more than two thousand years ago. [a See p. 243.

Relative Contributions to the Resultant.

So far we may go without difference of opinion. The only serious dispute arises when we ask what were the relative magnitudes of the contributions of the several dialects to the new resultant speech. That the literary *Κοινή* was predominantly Attic has been already stated, and is of course beyond doubt. But was Attic more than one among many elements assimilated in the new vernacular? It has always been taken for granted that the intellectual queen of Greece was the predominant partner in the business of establishing a new dialect based on a combination of the old ones. This conclusion has recently been challenged by Dr Paul Kretschmer, a brilliant comparative philologist, previously distinguished for his studies on the language of the Greek vase-inscriptions and on the dialects of the Greeks' nearest neighbours.[1] In his tractate entitled *Die Entstehung der Κοινή*, published in the Transactions of the Vienna Academy for 1900, he undertook to show that the oral *Κοινή* contained elements from Bœotian, Ionic, and even North-west Greek, to a larger extent than from Attic. His argument affects pronunciation mainly. That Bœotian monophthongising of the diphthongs, Doric softening of β, δ and γ, and Ionic de-aspiration of words beginning with *h*, affected the spoken language more than any Attic influence of this nature, might perhaps be allowed. But when we turn to features which had to be represented in writing, as contrasted with mere variant pronunciations of the same written word, the case becomes less striking. Bœotian may have supplied 3 plur. forms in -σαν for imperfect and optative, but these do not appear to any considerable extent outside the LXX: the NT exx. are precarious, and they are surprisingly rare in the papyri.[2] North-west Greek has the accusative plural in -ες, found freely in papyri and (for the word τέσσαρες) in MSS of the NT; also the middle conjugation of εἰμί, and the confusion of forms from -άω and -έω verbs. Doric contributes some guttural forms from verbs in -ζω, and a few lexical items. Ionic supplies a fair number of isolated forms, and may be responsible for many -ω or -ῶ flexions from -μι verbs, and some uncontracted noun-forms like ὀστέων or χρυσέῳ. But the one peculiarly Attic feature of the *Κοινή* which Kretschmer does allow, its treatment of original ᾱ, in contrast with Ionic phonology on one side and that of the remaining dialects on the other, is so far-reaching in its effects that we cannot but give it more weight than to any other feature. And while the accidence of Attic has bequeathed to the vernacular much matter which it shared with other dialects, one may question whether the accidence of any single dialect would present anything like the same similarity to that of the *Κοινή* as the Attic does. We can hardly resist the conclusion of the experts that Kretschmer has failed to prove his point. At the same time we may allow that the influence of the other dialects on *pronunciation* has been commonly underestimated. Kretschmer necessarily recognises that Attic supplied the orthography of the *Κοινή*, except for those uneducated persons to whom we owe so much for their instructive mis-spellings. Consequently, he says, when the Hellenist wrote *χαίρει* and pronounced it *chéri*, his language was really Bœotian and not Attic.[1] It is obvious that the question does not seriously concern us, since we are dealing with a language which, despite its vernacular character, comes to us in a written and therefore largely Atticised form.[a] For our purpose we may assume that we have before us a Greek which includes important contributions from various dialects, but with Attic as the basis, although the exclusive peculiarities of Attic make but a small show in it. We shall see later on (pp. 213ff.) that syntax tells a clearer story in at least one matter of importance, the articular infinitive.

---

[1] *Die griech. Vaseninschriften*, 1894; *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, 1896.

[2] See *CR* xv. 36, and the addenda in xviii. 110.

Pronunciation and MS Tradition.

At this point it should be observed that pronunciation is not to be passed over as a matter of no practical importance by the modern student of Hellenistic. The undeniable fact that phonetic spelling—which during the reign of the old dialects was a blessing common to all—was entirely abandoned by educated people generations before the Christian era, has some very obvious results for both grammar and textual criticism. That *αι* and *ε*, *ει* (*η*) and *ι*, *οι* and *υ* were identities for the scribes of our MSS, is certain.[2] The scribe made his choice according to the grammar and the sense.

---

[1] Against this emphasising of Bœotian, see Thumb, *Hellenismus* 228

[2] On the date of the levelling of quantity, so notable a feature in MGr, see Hatzidakis in *Ἀθηνᾶ* for 1901 (xiii. 247). He decides that it began outside Greece, and established itself very gradually. It must have been complete, or nearly so, before the scribes of ℵ and B wrote.

[[a] See p. 243.

just as we choose between *kings*, *king's*, and *kings'*, or between *bow* and *bough*. He wrote σύ nominative and σοί dative: λύσασθαι infinitive and λύσασθε imperative· φιλεῖς, εἴδομεν indicative, and φιλῇς, ἴδωμεν subjunctive; βούλει verb, but βουλῇ noun—here of course there was the accentual difference, if he wrote to dictation. There was nothing however to prevent him from writing ἐξέφνης, ἐφνίδιος, ἀφειρημένος, etc., if his antiquarian knowledge failed; while there were times when his choice between (for example) infinitive and imperative, as in Lk 19^{13}, was determined only by his own or perhaps a traditional exegesis. It will be seen therefore that we cannot regard our best MSS as decisive on such questions, except as far as we may see reason to trust their general accuracy in grammatical tradition. WH may be justified in printing ἵνα . . . ἐπισκιάσει in Ac 5^{15}, after B and some cursives; but the passage is wholly useless for any argument as to the use of ἵνα with a future. Or let us take the constructions of οὐ μή as exhibited for WH text in the concordance (MG). There are 71 occurrences with aor. subj., and 2 more in which the -σω might theoretically be future. Against these we find 8 cases of the future, and 15 in which the parsing depends on our choice between ει and ῃ. It is evident that editors cannot hope to decide here what was the autograph spelling. Even supposing they had the autograph before them, it would be no evidence as to the author's grammar if he dictated the text. To this we may add that by the time ℵ and B were written ο and ω were no longer distinct in pronunciation, which transfers two more cases to the list of the indeterminates. It is not therefore simply the overwhelming manuscript authority which decides us for ἔχωμεν in Rom 5^{1}. Without the help of the versions and patristic citations, it would be difficult to prove that the orthography of the MSS is really based on a very ancient traditional interpretation. It is indeed quite possible that the Apostle's own pronunciation did not distinguish ο and ω sufficiently to give Tertius a clear lead, without his making inquiry.[1] In all these matters we may fairly recognise a case nearly parallel with the editor's choice between such alternatives as *τίνες* and *τινές* in Heb 3^{16}, where the tradition varies. The modern expositor feels himself entirely at liberty to decide according to his view of the context. On our choice in Rom, *l.c.*, see below, (p. 110).

---

[1] ο and ω were confused in various quarters before this date: cf Schwyzer, *Pergam.* 95; Nachmanson, *Magnet.* 64; Thumb. *Hellenismus* 143. We have

Contributions of NW Greek,

Before we leave dialectology, it may be well to make a few more remarks on the nature of the contributions which we have noted. Some surprise may be felt at the importance of the elements alleged to have been brought into the language by the "North-west Greek,"[1] which lies altogether outside the literary limits. The group embraces as its main constituents the dialects of Epirus, Aetolia, Locris and Phokis, and Achaia, and is known to us only from inscriptions, amongst which those of Delphi are conspicuous. It is the very last we should have expected to influence the resultant language, but it is soon observed that its part (on Kretschmer's theory) has been very marked. The characteristic Achaian accus. plur. in -*ες* successfully established itself in the common Greek, as its presence in the vernacular of to-day sufficiently shows. Its prominence in the papyri[2] indicates that it was making a good fight, which in the case of *τέσσαρες* had already become a fairly assured victory. In the NT *τέσσαρας* never occurs without some excellent authority for *τέσσαρες*:[3] cf WH *App*^{2} 157.[a] Moreover we find that A, in Rev 1^{16}, has *ἀστέρες*—with omission of *ἔχων*, it is true, but this may well be an effort to mend the grammar. It is of course impossible to build on this example; but taking into account the obvious fact that the author of Rev was still decidedly *ἀγράμματος* in Greek, and remembering the similar phenomena of the papyri, we might expect his autograph to exhibit accusatives in -*ες*, and in other instances beside *τέσσαρες*. The middle conjugation of *εἰμί* is given by

---

confusion of this very word in BU 607 (ii/A.D.). See p. 244, and the copious early papyrus evidence in Mayser, pp. 98 f., 139.

[1] Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.*^{3} 17.

[[a] See pp. 243 f.

[2] See *CR* xv. 34, 435, xviii. 109 (where by a curious mistake I cited Dr Thumb for, instead of against, Kretschmer's argument on this point).

[3] Jn 11^{17} ℵ Δ; Ac 27^{29} and Rev 9^{14} ℵ; Rev 4^4 ℵ A (WH*mg*), 7^1 A *bis* P *semel.* Mr Thackeray says *τέσσαρες* acc. is constant in the B text of the Octateuch.

Kretschmer as a NW Greek feature; but the Delphian *ἦται* and *ἔωνται* are balanced by Messenian *ἦνται* and Lesbian *ἔσσο*, which looks as if some middle forms had existed in the earliest Greek. But the confusion of the *-άω* and *-έω* verbs, which is frequent in the papyri[1] and NT, and is complete in MGr, may well have come from the NW Greek, though encouraged by Ionic. We cannot attempt here to discuss the question between Thumb and Kretschmer; but an *a priori* argument might be found for the latter in the well-known fact that between iii/ and i/B.C. the political importance of Aetolia and Achaia produced an Achaian-Dorian *Κοινή*, which yielded to the wider *Κοινή* about a hundred years before Paul began to write: it seems antecedently probable that this dialect would leave some traces on that which superseded it. Possibly the extension of the 3rd plur. *-σαν*, and even the perfect *-αν*, may be due to the same source:[2] the former is also Bœotian. The peculiarities just mentioned have in common their *sporadic* acceptance in the Hellenistic of i/A.D., which is just what we should expect where a dialect like this contended for survival with one that had already spread over a very large area. The elements we have tentatively set down to the NW Greek secured their ultimate victory through their practical convenience. The fusion of *-άω* and *-έω* verbs amalgamated two grammatical categories which served no useful purpose by their distinctness. The accus. in *-ες* reduced the number of case-forms to be remembered, at the cost of a confusion which English bears without difficulty, and even Attic bore in *πόλεις*, *βασιλεῖς*, *πλείους*, etc.; while the other novelties both reduced the tale of equivalent suffixes and (in the case of *-σαν*) provided a useful means of distinction between 1st sing. and 3rd plur.

and of Ionic.

We come to securer ground when we estimate the part taken by Ionic in the formation of the *Κοινή*, for here Thumb and Kretschmer are at one. The former shows that we cannot safely trace any feature of Common Greek to the influence of some particular dialect, unless it appears in that dialect as a distinct new type, and not a mere survival. The nouns in -ᾶς -ᾶδος and -οῦς -οῦδος are by this principle recognised as a clear debt of MGr to Ionic elements in the *Κοινή*. Like the other elements which came from a single ancient dialect, they had to struggle for existence. We find them in the Egyptian Greek; but in the NT -ᾶς makes gen. -ᾶ, as often even in Asia Minor, where naturally -ᾶδος was at home.[1] Kretschmer gives as Ionic factors in the *Κοινή* the forms κιθών (= χιτών) and the like,[2] psilosis (which the Ionians shared with their Aeolic neighbours), the uncontracted noun and verb forms already alluded to, and the invasion of the -μι verbs by thematic forms (contract or ordinary).[3] He explains the declension σπεῖρα σπείρης (normal in the *Κοινή* from i/B.C.) as due not to Ionism, but to the analogy of γλῶσσα γλώσσης. To his argument on this point we might add the consideration that the declension -ρᾰ -ρης is both earlier and more stable than -υῖα -υίης, a difference which I would connect with the fact that the combination ιη continued to be barred in Attic at a time when ρη (from ρϜᾱ) was no longer objected to (contrast ὑγιᾶ and κόρη):[a] if Ionic forms had been simply taken over, εἰδυίης would have come in as early as σπείρης.

---

[1] See *CR* xv. 36, 435, xviii. 110. Thumb suggests that the common aor. in *-ησα* started the process of fusion.

[2] The *-σαν* suffix is found in Delphian (Valaori, *Delph. Dial.* 60) rather prominently, both in indic. and opt. The case for *-αν* (*ibid.*) is weaker.

Did dialectic differences persist?

But such discussion may be left to the philological journals. What concerns the NT student is the question of dialectic varieties within the *Κοινή* itself rather than in its previous history. Are we to expect persistence of Ionic features in Asia Minor; and will the Greek of Egypt, Syria,

---

[1] But -ᾶδος is rare both at Pergamum and at Magnesia: Schwyzer 139 f., Nachmanson 120.

[2] Κιθών, κύθρα and ἐνθαῦτα occur not seldom in papyri; and it is rather curious that they are practically absent from NT MSS. I can only find in Ti χειθῶνας D* (Mt 10^{10}) and κιτῶνας B* (Mk 14^{63}—"ut alibi ℵ," says the editor). Κύθρα occurs in Clem. Rom. 17 fin. (see Lightfoot); also three times in the LXX, according to great uncials (Thackeray). Βάθρακος, which is found in MGr (as Abbott 56) I cannot trace, nor πάθνη. Cf Hatzidakis 160 f.

[3] The perfect ἕωκα from ἵημι (NT ἀφέωνται) is noted as Ionic rather than Doric by Thumb, *ThLZ* xxviii. 421 n. Since this was a prehistoric form (cf Gothic *saisō* from *saia*, "sow"), we cannot determine the question certainly. But note that the imperative ἀφεώσθω occurs in an Arcadian inscription (Michel 585^{15}—iii/?B.C.). Its survival in Hellenistic is the more easily understood, if it really existed in two or three dialects of the classical period. [a See p. 244.

Macedonia, and Italy differ to an extent which we can detect after two thousand years? Speaking generally, we may reply in the negative. Dialectic differences there must have been in a language spoken over so large an area. But they need not theoretically be greater than those between British and American English, to refer again to the helpful parallel we examined above (p. 19). We saw there that in the modern *Weltsprache* the educated colloquial closely approximates everywhere when written down, differing locally to some extent, but in vocabulary and orthography rather than in grammar. The uneducated vernacular differs more, but its differences still show least in the grammar. The study of the papyri and the *Κοινή* inscriptions of Asia Minor discloses essentially the same phenomena in Hellenistic. There are few points of grammar in which the NT language differs from that which we see in other specimens of Common Greek vernacular, from whatever province derived. We have already mentioned instances in which what may have been quite possible Hellenistic is heavily overworked because it happens to coincide with a Semitic idiom. Apart from these, we have a few small matters in which the NT differs from the usage of the papyri. The weakening of *οὐ μή* is the most important of these, for certainly the papyri lend no countenance whatever to any theory that *οὐ μή* was a normal unemphatic negative in Hellenistic. We shall return to this at a later stage (see pp. 187 ff.); but meanwhile we may note that in the NT *οὐ μή* seems nearly always connected with "translation Greek"—the places where no Semitic original can be suspected show it only in the very emphatic sense which is common to classical and Hellenistic use. Among smaller points are the NT construction of *ἔνοχος* with gen. of penalty, and the prevailing use of *ἀπεκρίθην* for *ἀπεκρινάμην*: in both of these the papyri wholly or mainly agree with the classical usage; but that in the latter case the NT has good Hellenistic warrant, is shown by Phrynichus (see Rutherford, *NP* 186 ff.), by the witness of Polybius, and by the MGr *ἀποκρίθηκα*.

Thumb's Verdict.

The whole question of dialectic differences within the spoken *Κοινή* is judicially summed up by our greatest living authority, Dr Albert

Thumb, in chap. v. of his book on *Greek in the Hellenistic Age*, already often quoted.[1] He thinks that such differences must have existed largely, in Asia Minor especially; but that writings like the Greek Bible, intended for general circulation, employed a *Durchschnittsprache* which avoided local peculiarities, though intended for single localities. (The letters of Paul are no exception to this rule, for he could not be familiar with the peculiarities of Galatian or Achaian, still less of Roman, *Κοινή*.) To the question whether our authorities are right in speaking of a special Alexandrian Greek, Thumb practically returns a negative. For nearly all the purposes of our own special study, Hellenistic Greek may be regarded as a unity, hardly varying except with the education of the writer, his tendency to use or ignore specialities of literary language, and the degree of his dependence upon foreign originals which might be either freely or slavishly rendered into the current Greek.

It is however to be noted that the minute dialectic differences which can be detected in NT Greek are sometimes significant to the literary critic. In an article in *ThLZ*, 1903, p. 421, Thumb calls attention to the prominence of *ἐμός* in Jn, as against *μου* elsewhere.[2] He tells us that *ἐμός* and its like survive in modern Pontic-Cappadocian Greek, while the gen. of the personal pronoun has replaced it in other parts of the Greek-speaking area. This circumstance contributes something to the evidence that the Fourth Gospel came from Asia Minor. We might add that on the same showing Luke should come from Macedonia, or some other country outside Asia Minor, for he hardly uses *ἐμός*; while Rev, in which out of the four possessive pronouns *ἐμός* alone occurs, and that but once, seems to be from the pen of a recent immigrant. *Valeat quantum!* In the same paper Thumb shows that the infinitive still survives in Pontic, while in Greece proper it yields entirely to the periphrasis. The syntactical conditions under which the infinitive is found in Pontic answer very well to those which appear in the NT: in such uses Western Greek tended to enlarge the sphere of *ἵνα*. This test, applied to Jn, rather neutralises that from *ἐμός*: see below, p. 205, 211. Probably the careful study of local MGr patois will reveal more of these minutiæ. Another field for research is presented by the orthographical peculiarities of the NT uncials, which, in comparison with the papyri and inscriptions, will help to fix the *provenance* of the MSS, and thus supply criteria for that localising of textual types which is an indispensable step towards the ultimate goal of criticism.[1]

---

[1] Cf Blass 4 n.; and Thumb's paper in *Neue Jahrb.* for 1906.

[2] *Ἐμός* occurs 41 times in Jn, once each in 3 Jn and Rev, and 34 times in the rest of the NT. It must be admitted that the other possessives do not tell the same story: the three together appear 12 times in Jn (Ev and Epp), 12 in Lk, and 21 in the rest of NT. Blass (p. 168) notes how *ὑμῶν* in Paul (in the position of the attribute) ousts the emphatic *ὑμέτερος*. (For that position cf *ἡ σοῦ οὐσία*, Mithraslit. p. 17 and note.)

---

[1] One or two hints in this direction are given by Thumb, *Hellenismus* 179. Cf Prof. Lake's Leiden inaugural (Oxford, 1904). See also p. 244.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.—A few new points may be added on the subjects of this chapter. First comes the important fact—noted by Thumb in his *Hellenismus*, p. 9, and again in reviewing Mayser (*Archiv* iv. 487)—that the pre-Byzantine history of the Κοινή divides about the date A.D. The NT falls accordingly in the early years of a new period, which does not, however, differ from its predecessor in anything that ordinary observers would notice. The fact needs bearing in mind, nevertheless, when we are comparing the Greek of the LXX and the NT.

There are difficulties as to the relations of η, ῃ, and ει, which have some importance in view of the matters noted on p. 35. In Attic ῃ and ει were fused at an early date; whereas η remained distinct, being the *open e*, while in the diphthong it had become *close*. Ionic inscriptions show the same fusion. In papyri ῃ, like ῳ and ᾳ, sheds its ι just as η (ω and ᾱ) can add it, regardless of grammar; so that η and ῃ are equivalent, and they remain distinct from ει (=ι) till a late period. It is difficult to correlate these facts; but it must be remembered that the papyri only represent Egypt, which was not necessarily at one with all other Greek-speaking countries as to the quality of η. There is also the probability that the ῃ which alternates with η is often hysterogenous—βουλεῖ was replaced by a newly formed βουλῇ because of the η that runs through the rest of the singular flexion. (I owe many suggestions here to a letter from Prof. Thumb, March 1908.) See further Mayser 126 ff.

On the question of the contributions of the old dialects to the Κοινή, research seems progressively emphasising the preponderance of Attic. There are phenomena which are plausibly treated as Doric in origin; but Thumb reasonably points to Mayser's evidence, showing that these did not emerge till the later period of the Κοινή, as a serious difficulty in such an account of their history. On the other hand, he rightly criticises Mayser's tendency to minimise the Ionic influence: he believes that dialectic elements, and especially Ionisms, found their way into the spoken Attic of the lower classes, which spread itself largely through the operation of trade. "The first people to speak a Κοινή were Ionians, who used the speech of their Athenian lords. . . . Outside the Athenian empire, the Macedonians were the first to take up the new language, and joined their subject Greeks, especially Ionians, in spreading it through the world." The old dialects worked still in producing local differentiations in the Κοινή itself.

CHAPTER III.

NOTES ON THE ACCIDENCE.

The Uncials and the Papyri.

BEFORE we begin to examine the conditions of Hellenistic syntax, we must devote a short chapter to the accidence. To treat the forms in any detail would be obviously out of place in these *Prolegomena.* The humble but necessary work of gathering into small compass the accidence of the NT writers I have done in my little *Introduction* (see above, p. 1 n.); and it will have to be done again more minutely in the second part of this *Grammar.* In the present chapter we shall try to prepare ourselves for answering a preliminary question of great importance, viz., what was the position occupied by the NT writers between the literary and illiterate Greek of their time. For this purpose the forms give us a more easily applied test than the syntax. But before we can use them we must make sure that we have them substantially as they stood in the autographs. May not such MSS as ℵ and B—and D still more—have conformed their orthography to the popular style, just as those of the "Syrian" revision conformed it in some respects to the literary standards? We cannot give a universal answer to this question, for we have seen already that an artificial orthography left the door open for not a few uncertainties. But there are some suggestive signs that the great uncials, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs. A very instructive phenomenon is the curious substitution of *ἐάν* for *ἄν* after *ὅς*, *ὅπου*, etc., which WH have faithfully reproduced in numberless places from the MSS. This was so little recognised as a genuine feature of vernacular Greek, that the editors of the volumes of papyri began by gravely subscribing "l. *ἄν*" wherever the abnormal *ἐάν* showed itself. They were soon compelled to save themselves the trouble. Deissmann, *BS* 204, gave a considerable list from the papyri, which abundantly proved the genuineness of this ἐάν; and four years later (1901) the material had grown so much that it was possible to determine the time-limits of the peculiarity with fair certainty. If my count is right,[1] the proportion of ἐάν to ἄν is 13 : 29 in papyri dated B.C. The proportion was soon reversed, the figures being 25 : 7 for i/A.D., 76 : 9 for ii/, 9 : 3 for iii/, 4 : 8 for iv/. This ἐάν occurs last in a vi/ papyrus. It will be seen that the above construction was specially common in i/ and ii/, when ἐάν greatly predominated, and that the fashion had almost died away before the great uncials were written. It seems that in this small point the uncials faithfully reproduce originals written under conditions long obsolete.[2] This particular example affords us a very fair test; but we may reinforce it with a variety of cases where the MSS accurately reproduce the spelling of i/A.D. We will follow the order of the material in WH *App*^{2} 148 ff. ("Notes on Orthography"): it is unnecessary to give detailed references for the papyrus evidence, which will be found fully stated in the papers from *CR*, already cited. We must bear in mind throughout Hort's caution (p. 148) that "all our MSS have to a greater or less extent suffered from the effacement of unclassical forms of words." Note also his statement that the "Western" MSS show the reverse tendency. "The orthography of common life, which to a certain extent was used by all the writers of the NT, though in unequal degrees, would naturally be introduced more freely in texts affected by an instinct of popular adaptation." He would be a bold man who should claim that even Hort has said the last word on the problem of the δ-text; and with our new knowledge of the essentially popular character of NT Greek as a whole, we shall naturally pay special attention to documents which desert the classical spelling for that which we find prevailing in those papyri that were written by men of education approximately parallel with that of the apostolic writers.

---

[1] *CR* xv. 32, xv. 434: for the exx. B.C. I have added figures from papyri read up to 1905. See further on p. 234; and compare Mr Thackeray's independent statistics in *JTS* ix. 95, which give the same result.

[2] The case of ἄν, *if*, is separate. In the NT this is confined apparently to Jn, where it occurs six times. In the papyri it is decidedly a symptom of illiteracy. With this agrees what Meisterhans^3 255 f. says: "Only six times is ἄν found from v/ to iii/B.C. The form ἄν is entirely foreign to the Attic inscriptions, though it is often found in the Ionicising literary prose of v/ (Thucydides: cf the Tragedians)." Since ἄν is the modern form, we may perhaps regard it as a dialectic variant which ultimately ousted the Attic ἐάν. It is not clear to what dialect it is to be assigned. Against Meisterhans' suggestion of Ionic stands the opinion of H. W. Smyth (*Ionic Dialect*, p. 609) that its occasional appearances in Ionic are due to Atticising! Certainly ἤν is the normal Ionic form, but ἄν may have been Ionic as well, though rarer. (So Dr P. Giles.) Nachmanson (p. 68) gives ἐάν as the only form from Magnesia. Some peculiar local distribution is needed to explain why ἄν (*if*) is absent from the incorrectly written Rev, and reserved for the correct Jn. Both ἄν and ἐάν are found promiscuously in the Herculaneum rolls (Crönert 130).

Orthography. We begin with the "unusual aspirated forms" (p. 150), *ἐφ' ἑλπίδι* etc., *καθ' ἱδίαν*, *ἅφιδε* etc., and *οὐχ ὁλίγος.*[a] For all these there is a large body of evidence from papyri and inscriptions. There are a good many other words affected thus, the commonest of which, *ἕτος*, shows no trace of the aspiration in NT uncials. Sins of commission as well as omission seem to be inevitable when initial *h* has become as weak as in later Greek or in modern English. Hence in a period when de-aspiration was the prevailing tendency, analogy produced some cases of reaction,—*καθ' ἕτος* due to *καθ' ἡμέραν*, *ἅφιδε* to *ἀφορᾶν*, etc.;[1] and the two types struggled for survival. MGr *ἐφέτο* shows that the aspirated form did not always yield. The uncertainty of the MS spelling thus naturally follows from the history of the aspirate. It is here impossible to determine the spelling of the autographs, but the wisdom of following the great uncials becomes clearer as we go on. The reverse phenomenon, *psilosis*, exx. of which figure on p. 151, is part of the general tendency which started from the Ionic and Aeolic of Asia Minor and became universal, as MGr shows. The mention of *ταμεῖον* (p. 152—add *πεῖν* from

---

[1] The curious coincidence that many, but by no means all, of these words once began with ϝ, led to the fancy (repeated by Hort) that the lost consonant had to do with the aspiration. I need not stay to explain why this cannot be accepted. The explanation by analogy within the Κοινή is that favoured by Thumb. (See additional note, p. 234.)

[[a] See p. 244.

p. 177) brings up a Hellenistic sound-law, universal after A.D., viz. the coalescence of two successive *i* sounds; the inf. *διασεῖν* for *-σείειν* (LP*g*—i/B.C.) will serve as a good example—cf *ἀνασῖ* in Lk 23^5 ℵ.[1] *Ταμεῖον*, *πεῖν* and *ὑγεία* are overwhelmingly attested by the papyri of the Roman age, where we seldom find the reversion seen in Mt 20^{22}. In *ἁλεεῖς* (Mk 1^{17} *al*) we have dissimilation instead of contraction. Under the head of Elision (p. 153), it may be worth while to mention that the neglect of this even in a verse citation, as in the MSS at 1 Co 15^{33}, is in accord with an exceedingly common practice in inscriptions. The presence or absence of movable *ν* (pp. 153 f.) cannot be reduced to any visible rule: the evanescence of the nasal in pronunciation makes this natural. Cf p. 49 below. Among the spellings recorded on pp. 155 f. we note *σφυρίς*, *γένημα* (vegetable product), and *-χύννω*[2] as well attested in the papyri; while the wavering of usage between *ρρ* and *ρσ* is traceable down through Hellenistic to MGr.[3] The case of the spelling *ἀραβών* ("only Western") is instructive. Deissmann (*BS* 183) gives but one ex. of the *ρρ* form, and nine of the single consonant, from three documents. His natural questioning of Hort's orthography is curiously discounted by the papyri published up to 1905, which make the totals 11 for the "Western" and 15 for *ρρ*.[4] The word will serve as a reminder that only the unanimity of the papyri can make us really sure of our autographs' spelling: cf Deissmann, *BS* 181. The wavering of inscriptional testimony as to *Ζμύρνα* (*ib.* 185) makes it impossible to be decisive; but the coincidence of Smyrnæan coins makes it seem difficult to reject the witness of ℵ, on suspicion of "Western" taint. In words with *σσ* the papyri show the Attic *ττ* in about the same small proportion as the NT uncials, and with much the same absence of intelligible principle. *Ὄρνιξ* (Lk 13^{34} ℵD, also banned as "Western") has some papyrus warrant, and survives in the MGr (Cappadocian) *ὀρνίχ*: cf Thumb, *Hellen.* 90. It started in Doric Greek. Coming to the note on *τέσσαρες* and *τεσσα-*

---

[1] Buresch *RhM* xlvi. 213 n. Correct Ti *in loc.* So *ἀποκλεῖν*, OP 265 (i/A.D.).

[2] So MGr (Cyprus), says Thumb in *ThLZ* xxviii. 423.

[3] Thumb *l.c.* 422. On this and the *σσ*, *ττ*, see now Wackernagel's *Hellenistica* (1907).

[4] *CR* xv. 33, since supplemented.

ράκοντα (p. 157), we meet our first dissonance between NT uncials and papyri. The *ε* forms are in the latter relatively few, and distinctly illiterate, in the first centuries A.D. Indeed the evidence for *τέσσερα* or *τέσσερας* is virtually *nil* before the Byzantine age,[1] and there does not seem to be the smallest probability that the Apostles wrote anything but the Attic form. For *τεσσεράκοντα* the case is a little better, but it is hopelessly outnumbered by the *-αρ-* form in documents antedating the NT uncials; the modern *σεράντα*, side by side with *σαράντα*, shows that the strife continued. No doubt before iv/A.D. *τέσσερες -α* (not *τεσσέρων*) had begun to establish themselves in the place they hold to-day. *Ἐραυνάω* is certain from i/A.D. onward;[2] and Mayser (pp. 42, 56) gives a ii/B.C. papyrus parallel for *ἐγγαρεύω* (ℵ *bis*, B *semel*). Spellings like *κρίμα* (p. 158) are supported by a great multiplication in *Κοινή* documents of *-μα* nouns with shortened penultimate. Cf Moeris (p. 28), *ἀνάθημα Ἀττικῶς*, *ἀνάθεμα Ἑλληνικῶς*; and note *ἀφεύρεμα bis* in Par P 62 (ii/B.C.). Even *σύστεμα* is found (not **σύσταμα*), Gen 1^{10}, which shows how late and mechanical this process was. The convenient differentiation of meaning between *ἀνάθημα* and *ἀνάθεμα*[3] preserved the former intact, though ℵADX are quotable for the levelling in its one NT occurrence. The complete establishment of *εἶ μήν* after iii/B.C. is an interesting confirmation of the best uncials. Despite Hort (p. 158), we must make the difference between *εἶ μήν* and *ἦ μήν* "strictly orthographical" after all, if the alternative is to suppose any connexion with *εἰ*, *if*. Numerous early citations make this last assumption impossible.[4] On *ει* and *ι* (p. 153) the papyri are entirely indecisive: *ει* even for *ῐ* is an everyday occurrence. At any rate they give no encouragement to our introducing *γείνομαι* and *γεινώσκω*, as WH would like to do: to judge from mere impressions, *γίνομαι* is at least as common as *γείνομαι*. This matter of the notorious equivalence of *ει* and *ι* is adduced by Thumb (reviewing Blass^2, *ThLZ*, 1903, 421) as a specimen of philological facts which are not always present to the minds of theological text-critics: he cites Brooke and M'Lean (*JTS*, 1902, 601 ff.), who seriously treat *ἴδεν*, *ἴδον*, as various readings deserving a place in the LXX text. Ti did the same in Rev, where even WH (see *App*^{2} 169) marked *ἴδον*, etc., as alternative. In this matter no reader of the papyri would care to set much store by some of the minutiæ which WH so conscientiously gather from the great uncials. It would probably be safer in general to spell according to tradition; for even WH admit that their paramount witness, B, "has little authority on behalf of *ει* as against *ι*." Finally might be mentioned a notable matter of pronunciation to which Hort does not refer. The less educated papyrus writers very frequently use *ᾱ* for *αυ*, before consonants, from ii/B.C. onwards.[1] Its frequent appearance in Attic inscriptions after 74 B.C. is noted by Meisterhans^3 154. In Lk 2^1 (*Ἀγούστου*) this pronunciation shows itself, according to ℵC**Δ*; but we do not seem to find *ἀτός*, *ἑατόν*, etc., in the MSS, as we should have expected.[2] An excellent suggestion is made by Dr J. B. Mayor (*Expos.* VI. x. 289)—following up one of Hort's—that *ἀκαταπάστους* in 2 Pet 2^{14} AB may be thus explained: he compares *ἀχμηρῷ* 1^{19} A. In arguing his case, he fails to see that the dropping of a *υ* (or rather *Ϝ*) between *vowels* is altogether another thing; but his remaining exx. (to which add those cited from papyri in *CR* xv. 33, 434, xviii. 107) are enough to prove his point. Laurent remarks (*BCH*, 1903, p. 356) that this phenomenon was common in the latter half of i/B.C. We need not assume its existence in the NT autographs.

---

[1] *Τέσσαρες* acc. is another matter: see above, p. 36.

[2] But *ἔρευνα* in the Ptolemaic PP iii. 65 *bis*, Par P 60^2, and Tb P 38, *al.* So also MGr. *Ἔραυνα* was limited in range. See Buresch, *RhM* xlvi. 213 f.; but note also Thumb, *Hellen.* 176 f., who disposes of the notion that it was an Alexandrinism. Kretschmer, *DLZ*, 1901, p. 1049, brings parallels from Thera (*αὐ-* in compounds of *εὖ*). See papyrus citations in *CR* xv. 34, xviii. 107.

[3] Deissmann has shown that *ἀνάθεμα*, *curse*, is not an innovation of "Biblical Greek" (*ZNTW* ii. 342).

[4] The syntax is decisive in the Messenian "Mysteries" inscription (91 B.C., *Syll.* 653, Michel 694): *ὀρκιζόντω τὸν γυναικονόμον· εἶ μὰν ἕξειν ἐπιμέλειαν, κτλ.* (The same inscription has *εἶτεν* for *εἶτα*, as in Mk 4^{28}: this is also Ionic.) Add *Syll.* 578 (iii/B.C.), and note. PP iii. 56 (before 260 B.C.) has *ἦ*, but I have 11 papyrus exx. of *εἶ* from ii/B.C. to i/A.D.

---

[1] The same tendency appeared in late vulgar Latin, and perpetuated itself in Romance: see Lindsay, *Latin Language* 41 f. See early exx. in Mayser 114.

[2] In MGr (see Thumb, *Handbuch*, p. 59) we find *αὐτός* (pronounced *aftós*) side by side with *ἀτός* (obsolete except in Pontus), whence the short form *τό*, etc. There was therefore a grammatical difference in the Κοινή itself.

Inflexion :— Nouns. We pass on to the noun flexion (p. 163). Nouns in *-ρᾰ* and participles in *-υῖα* in the papyri regularly form genitive and dative in *-ης -ῃ*, except that *-υίας*, *-υίᾳ* are still found in the Ptolemaic period. Here again the oldest uncials alone (in NT, but very rarely in LXX) generally support the unmistakable verdict of the contemporary documents of the *Κοινή*. We saw reason (above, p. 38) to regard this as the analogical assimilation of *-ρᾰ* nouns (and—somewhat later and less markedly— *-υῖα* participles) to the other *-ᾰ* flexions of the first declension, rather than as an Ionic survival. We may add that as *μάχαιρα* produced *μαχαίρης* on the model of *δόξα δόξης*, so, by a reverse analogy process, the gen. *Νύμφης* as a proper name produced what may be read as *Νύμφᾰ Νύμφᾰν* in nom. and acc.: the best reading of Col 4[15] (*αὐτῆς* B) may thus stand, without postulating a Doric *Νύμφᾱν*, the improbability of which decides Lightfoot for the alternative.[1] The heteroclite proper names, which fluctuate between 1st and 3rd decl., are paralleled by Egyptian place-names in papyri. Critics, like Clemen, whose keen scent has differentiated documents by the evidence of *Λύστραν* and *Λύστροις* in Ac 14[6.8] (see Knowling, *EGT in loc.*),[2] might be invited to track down the "redactor" who presumably perpetrated either *Κερκεσούχη* or *Κερχεσούχων* in GH 46 (ii/A.D.). Ramsay (*Paul* 129) shows that *Μύρα* had acc. *-αν* and gen. *-ων*. Uncritical people may perhaps feel encouraged thus to believe that Mt 2[1] and Mt 2[3], despite the heteroclisis, are from the same hand.[a] The variations between 1st and 2nd decl. in words like *ἑκατόνταρχος* (*-ης*) are found *passim* in papyri: for conscientious labour wasted thereon see Schmiedel's amusing note in his *Preface* to WS. In contracted nouns and adjectives we have abundant parallels for forms like *ὀστέων*, *χρυσέων*, and for *χρυσᾶν* (formed by analogy of *ἀργυρᾶν*). The good attestation of the type *νοός νοΐ*, after the analogy of *βοῦς*, may be observed in passing. The fact that we do not find short forms of nouns in *-ιος -ιον* (e.g. *κύρις*, *παιδίν*)[b] is a noteworthy test of the educational standard of the writers, for the papyri show them even as early as iii/B.C., and always in company with other indications of comparative illiteracy. These forms, the origin of which seems to me as perplexed as ever, despite the various efforts of such scholars as Thumb, Hatzidakis, and Brugmann to unravel it, ultimately won a monopoly, as MGr shows everywhere. We must not omit mention of the "Mixed Declension," which arose from analogies in the -ᾱ- and -ο- nouns, and spread rapidly because of its convenience, especially for foreign names. The stem ends in a long vowel or diphthong, which receives -ς for nom. and -ν for acc., remaining unchanged in voc., gen. and dat. sing. *Ἰησοῦς* is the most conspicuous of many NT exx. It plays a large part in MGr.[1] Passing lightly over the exact correspondence between uncials and papyri in the accusatives of *κλείς* and *χάρις* (p. 164), we may pause on *χεῖραν* in Jn 20^{25} ℵ*AB. The great frequency of this formation in uneducated papyri, which adequately foreshadows its victory in MGr,[2] naturally produced sporadic examples in our MSS, but it is not at all likely that the autographs showed it (unless possibly in Rev). Gregory (in Ti, vol. iii. 118 f.) registers forms like *ἀσφαλῆν* and *ποδήρην*, which also have papyrus parallels, but could be explained more easily from the analogy of 1st decl. nouns. *Μείζων* acc. (Jn 5^{36} ABEGMΔ) is a good example of the irrational addition of *ν*, which seems to have been added after long vowels almost as freely as the equally unpronounced *ι*.[3] One further noun calls for comment, viz., *Ἐλαιῶνος* in Ac 1^{12} (p. 165). The noun *ἐλαιών* = *olivetum* occurs at least thirty times in papyri between i/ and iii/A.D., which prompts surprise at Blass's continued scepticism. *Ἑλικών* (*salicetum*) is an ancient example of the turning of a similar word into a proper name.[4]

---

[1] See the writer's paper in *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* Oct. 1893, p. 12, where the archaic vocative in -ᾰ is suggested as the connecting link. Cf Δοῦλα as a proper name (Dieterich, *Unters.* 172), and Εἰρῆνα in a Christian inscr. (Ramsay, *C. & B.* ii. 497 n.).

[2] Cf Harnack, *Apostelg.* 86 n.

[[a] [b] See p. 244.

---

[1] See *CR* xviii. 109, Kühner-Blass § 136.

[2] It seems most probable that the modern levelling of 1st and 3rd decl. started with this accusative. See Thumb, *Handbuch* 28, 35; also p. 18 for the pronunciation of -ν final. The formation occurs often in LXX.

[3] Thus ἅλωι is acc. sing., while ἦν (= ᾖ) is sometimes subjunctive. For exx. see *CR* xviii. 108. So ὅσα ἐὰν ἦν in Gen 6^{17} E. See p. 168.

[4] See Deissmann, *BS* 208 ff., and the addenda in *Expos.* VI. vii. 111, viii. 429; also below, pp. 69 and 235. See also p. 244, on συγγενεῦσι (*App.*^{3} 165).

Indeclinable Adjectives. Two curious indeclinables meet us periodically among the adjectives. Πλήρης should be read in Mk 4^{28} (C*, Hort) and Ac 6^{5} (ℵAC*DEHP *al.*), and is probably to be recognised in Jn 1^{14} (-ρη D). Cf 2 Jn^{8} (L), Mk 8^{19} (AFGM *al.*), Ac 6^{3} (AEHP *al.*) 19^{28} (AEL 13). Thus in almost every NT occurrence of an oblique case of this word we meet with the indeclinable form in good uncials. The papyrus citations for this begin with LP*c* (ii/B.C.), which suits its appearance in the LXX. We cannot well credit educated writers, such as Luke, with this vulgar form; but I readily concede to Deissmann (*Licht v. Osten* 85 f.) that it is possible in Jn. (Here B. Weiss and others would make the adj. depend in sense upon αὐτοῦ, but δόξαν seems more appropriate, from the whole trend of the sentence: it is the "glory" or "self-revelation" of the Word that is "full of grace and truth.") One might fairly doubt whether expositors would have thought of making καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πατρός a parenthesis, had it not been for the supposed necessity of construing πλήρης as a nominative. We restore the popular form also in Mk.[1] The other indeclinables in question are πλείω and the other forms in -ω from the old comparative base in *-yos.* Crönert (in *Philologus* lxi. 161 ff.) has shown how frequently in papyri and even in literature these forms are used, like πλήρης and ἥμισυ, without modification for case. In Mt 26^{53} we have a good example preserved in ℵBD, the later MSS duly mending the grammar with πλείους. Is it possible that the false reading in Jn 10^{29} started from an original μείζω of this kind?

Many more noun forms might be cited in which the MSS prove to have retained the genuine Hellenistic, as evidenced by the papyri; but these typical examples will serve.

See the full evidence in Crönert *Mem.* 179 : add *CR* xv. 35, 435, xviii. 109 ; also C. H. Turner in *JTS* i. 120 ff. and 561 f. ; Radermacher in *RhM* lvii. 151 ; Reinhold 53. Deissmann, *New Light* 44 f., deals briefly with Jn *l.c.* Winer, p. 705, compares the "grammatically independent" πλήρης clause with the nom. seen in Phil 3^{19}, Mk 12^{40}. W. F. Moulton makes no remark there, but in the note on Jn 1^{14} (Milligan-Moulton *in loc.*) he accepts the construction found in the RV, or permits his colleague to do so. At that date the case for the indeclinable πλήρης was before him only in the LXX (as Job 21^{24} ℵBAC). See Blass 81 n. : Mr R. R. Ottley adds a probable ex. in Is 63^{2} B.

Verbs naturally supply yet more abundant material, but we need not cite it fully here. Pursuing the order of WH *App*[2] **Verbs ;—** we pause a moment on the dropped augments, etc., in pp. 168 f., which are well illustrated in papyri. This phenomenon goes back to Herodotus, and **Augments.** may well be a contribution of Ionic to the Common Greek. Diphthongs are naturally the first to show the tendency: it is not likely, for example, that Drs Grenfell and Hunt would now, as in the *editio princeps* of the Oxyrhynchus Logia (1897, p. 7), call *οἰκοδομημένη* a "more serious error" than *αι* for *ε* or *ει* for *ι*. The double augment of *ἀπεκατεστάθη* in papyri and NT may be noted as a suggestive trifle under this head of augments before we pass **Person-endings.** on. Very satisfactory confirmation of our uncial tradition is supplied by the person-endings. The functionally useless difference of ending between the strong and the weak aorist began to disappear in our period. The strong aorist act. or mid. is only found in some thirty *-ω* verbs (and their compounds) in the NT; and while the great frequency of their occurrence protected the root-form, the overwhelming predominance of the sigmatic aorist tended to drive off the field its rival's person-endings. The limits of this usage in the NT text are entirely in accord with the better-written papyri. Thus we find little encouragement for *γενάμενος*,[1] for which any number of papyrus citations may be made. But when we notice *γενα* [. . .] in BU 1033 (ii/A.D.) corrected to *γενο* . . . by a second hand,[2] we see that education still rebelled against this development, which had begun with the Attic *εἶπας* centuries before. The tendency, in fairly cultured speech, mainly concerned the act., and the indic. middle. For the details see the careful note in WS p. 111. Whether the same intrusion should be allowed in the imperf., *e.g.* *εἶχαν* Mk 8^7, is doubtful, in view of the scanty warrant from the papyri. It is for the same reason more than doubtful whether we can accept *παρελάβοσαν* 2 Th 3^6 א*AD*: I have only 4 imperf. and 2 aor. exx. from Ptolemaic times, and the forms *ἐλαμβάνεσαν* and *ἀφίλεσαν* (BM 18, 41, 161 B.C.—cited by WM 91 n.^{5}) show that the innovation had not attained great fixity before i/A.D. The ocular confusion suggested by Hort in 2 Th *l.c.* would be furthered by the later currency of this convenient ending. What we find it hard to allow in a writer of Paul's culture is a little easier in Jn ($15^{22. 24}$ אBL etc.); and *ἐδολιοῦσαν* Rom 3^{13} (LXX) might have been written by Paul himself, apart from quotation—we can hardly cite any other 3 pl. imperf. from *-όω* verbs. As early as ii/B.C. we find *ἠξιοῦσαν* in *Magn.* 47: see Nachmanson's parallels, pp. 148 f. The *-ες* of 2 sg. perf., read by WH in Rev $2^{3. 5}$ 11^{17}, and in 1st aor. Rev 2^4, may perhaps be allowed in Rev as a mark of imperfect Greek: it has no warrant from educated writing outside.[1] The 3 pl. perf. in ***-αν*** is well attested in Ac 16^{36} and Ro 16^7 אAB, Lk 9^{36} BLX, Col 2^1 א*ABCD*P, as well as in Jn, Jas and Rev, where it raises less difficulty. It certainly makes a fair show in the papyri, from 164 B.C. down (see Mayser 323), but not in documents which would encourage us to receive it for Luke or even Paul. As the only difference between perf. and 1 aor.-endings, the ***-ασι*** was foredoomed to yield to the assimilating tendency; but possible occurrences of ***-αν*** are relatively few, and the witness of the papyri indecisive, and it is safer, except in Rev, to suppose it a vulgarism due to the occasional lapse of an early scribe.[2] If it were really Alexandrian, as Sextus Empiricus says, we could understand its comparative frequency in the papyri; but Thumb decisively rejects this (*Hellenismus* 170), on the ground of its frequent appearance elsewhere.[3] The termination *-ασι* invades what is formally, though not in meaning, a present, in the case of *ἥκασι*, which is a genuine vernacular form (cf *ἥκαμεν* in Par P 48 (ii/B.C.)). WH (*App*^{2} 176) reject it as "Western" in Mk 8^3, regarding it as a paraphrase of *εἰσίν* (BLΔ); but it must be observed that the Lewis Syriac is now to be added to ℵADN, with the Latin and other versions, which support it. It is after all a form which we might expect in Mk, and equally expect to find removed by revisers, whether Alexandrian or Syrian. By way of completing the person-endings, we may observe that the pluperf. act. has exclusively the later *-ειν* form, with *-ει-* even in 3 pl.;[1] and that the 3 pl. imper. in *-τωσαν* and *-σθωσαν* are unchallenged.

---

[1] So Lk 22^{44} ℵ, Lk 24^{22} B, and Mk 6^{26} and 15^{42} Δ: there is no further uncial support, if Ti is reliable, throughout Mt, Mk, and Lk, in a total of 40 occurrences. The ptc. does not occur in Jn. I have not looked further.

[2] *Εὑράμενος* in Heb 9^{12} (all uncials except D_2) is perhaps due to the frequency of 1st aor. in *-ρα*. The ptc. itself appears in an inscr. of the Roman age, *IMA* iii. 1119. P. Buttmann cites *γενάμενος* from Archimedes (iii/B.C.), though Wilamowitz-Möllendorf in his extracts from the *Psammites* (*Lesebuch* 243 ff.) edits *γενόμενος* seven times. But in a Doric author the question concerns us little MGr shews that *γενάμενος* came to stay.

---

[1] Even B shows it, in Ac 21^{22}. Note also *ἀπεκάλυψες* Mt 11^{25} D.

[2] *Γέγοναν* formed the starting-point of a valuable paper by K. Buresch in *RhM*, 1891, pp. 193 ff., which should not be missed by the student of Hellenistic, though it needs some modification in the light of newer knowledge. Thus he accepts the Alexandrian *provenance* of this and the *-οσαν* type.

[3] At Delphi, for example, with imperf. and aor. *-οσαν* (see p. 37).

Taking up the contract verbs, we note how the confusions between *-άω* and *-έω* forms (p. 173) are supported by our external evidence, and by MGr. Our first serious revolt from WH concerns the infinitive in *-οῖν* (and by analogy *-ᾷν*). The evidence for it is "small, but of good quality" (p. 173—cf *Introd.* § 410): it is in fact confined to B*D in Mt 13^{32}, B* in Mk 4^{32}, ℵ* in 1 Pet 2^{15}, BD* in Heb 7^5 (where see Ti), and a lectionary in Lk 9^{31}. This evidence may pass if our object is merely to reproduce the spelling of the age of B; but absolutely no corroboration seems discoverable, earlier than the date of B itself, except an inscription cited in Hatzidakis (p. 193),[2] and two papyri, BM iii. p. 136 *bis* (18 A.D.), and PFi 24 (ii/A.D.). Blass (p. 48) does not regard the form as established for the NT. We can quote against it from i–iv/A.D. plentiful exx. of *-οῦν* in papyri. (That *-οῦν* and *-ᾶν* (not *ᾷν*) are the correct Attic forms, may be seen from Meisterhans^3 175 f., which Hort's hesitation as to *-ᾶν* prompts me to quote: for the reason of the apparent irregularity see Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.*^{3} 61, or WS 42.) Next may be named, for *-άω* verbs, the 2nd sing. pres. mid. in *-ᾶσαι* (*καυχᾶσαι*, *ὀδυνᾶσαι*), which has been formed afresh in the *Κοινή* with the help of the *-σαι* that answers to 3rd sing. -ται in the perfect.[1] It is well paralleled by the early fut. χαριεῖσαι in GH 14 *c* (iii/B.C.), for which χαρίεσαι appears in OP 292 (i/A.D.). Φάγεσαι and πίεσαι, which naturally went together, give us the only exx. outside -άω verbs, to which the quotations in G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*^{3} 549 suggest that the innovation was mainly confined. The later extensions may be noted in Hatzidakis 188. Note the converse change in δύνῃ. Unfortunately we do not seem to have exx. of the subj. of -όω verbs, to help the parsing of ἵνα ζηλοῦτε and the like (p. 167). Blass (Kühner^3 i. 2. 587, and *Gr.* 48) accepts Hort's view that the subj. of these verbs became identical with the indic., just as it always was in the -άω verbs. (See W. F. Moulton's note, WM 363. Ex 1^{16} ὅταν μαιοῦσθε . . . καὶ ὦσι, there cited, is a very good example.) But Blass rightly, I think, rejects the supposition that εὐοδῶται (1 Co 16^2) can be anything but a pres. subj. To read εὐόδωται, as perf. indic., is possible, though the editors do not seem by their printing to have favoured that alternative. That it is a perf. subj. is extremely unlikely. The parallels on which Hort (p. 179) relies—set forth with important additions in Blass's Kühner i. 2. 100 f.—do nothing to make it likely that the Κοινή had any perf. subj. apart from the ordinary periphrastic form.[2] It is hard, moreover, to see why the pres. subj. is not satisfactory here: see Dr Findlay's note *in loc.* (*EGT* vol. ii.). Finally we note the disappearance of the -ήω verbs from the Κοινή, with the exception of ζήω and χρήομαι[3] (as we ought to call them); also the sporadic appearance of the uncontracted ἐδέετο Lk 8^{38} (B and a few others -εῖτο, which looks like a correction). It is supported by Esth 14^3 A, BU 926 (ii/A.D.) and the Mithras Liturgy (p. 12): it is probably, as Blass suggests, a mere analogy-product from δέομαι conjugated like λύομαι,[1] and owes nothing to Ionic. It affords no warrant for suspecting uncontracted forms elsewhere: κατέχεεν Mk 14^{3} is an aor., as in Attic.

---

[1] There are isolated exceptions in the papyri.

[2] So WS 116 n. Two other inscriptions are cited by Hatzidakis, but without dates. Vitelli (on PFi *l.c.*) refers to Crönert 220 n., who corrects Schmiedel's philology: the form is of course a simple product of analogy—*λύει : λύειν : : δηλοῖ : δηλοῖν*.

---

[1] To suppose this (or φάγεσαι, similarly formed from φάγεται) a genuine survival of the pre-Greek *-esai*, is characteristic of the antediluvian philology which still frequently does duty for science in this country. Krumbacher, *KZ* xxvii. 497, scoffs at E. Curtius for talking of an "uralte" -σαι.

[2] To argue this would demand a very technical discussion. It is enough to say that the Attic κεκτῶμαι and μεμνῶμαι are not derivative verbs, and that the three derivative verbs which can be quoted, from Doric, Cretan and Ionic respectively, supply slender justification for the supposed Κοινή parallel.

[3] Χρᾶσθαι was the Hellenistic infin., but there is no example of it in NT.

Verbs in -μι.

The verbs in -μι continued in Hellenistic to suffer from the process of gradual extinction which began even in Homeric Greek, and in MGr has eliminated every form outside the verb "be." The papyri agree with the NT uncials in showing forms like δύνομαι and -έδετο (as well as -έδοτο), and various flexions after contract verb types. New verbs like ἱστάνω[2] are formed, and new tenses like ἕστᾰκα (transitive). The most important novelty apart from these is the aor. subj. δοῖ and γνοῖ,[3] as to which W. F. Moulton's view (WM 360 n.) is finally established by good attestation from papyri. The pres. subj. διδοῖ, after the -όω verbs, set the analogy at work. That in much later documents such forms may be opt. need not trouble us. The form δῴη is more difficult. Schwyzer (p. 191) quotes Moeris for ποιῴη in Common Greek, and calls in the analogy of τιμῴη: the further step to δῴη (also attested by Moeris) was eased by the fact that δοίη drew towards dīī, and would consequently become monosyllabic: see p. 45. Δώη (subj.) seems a syntactical necessity in Eph 1^{17} (B δῷ), 2 Tim 2^{25} (cf later uncials in Eph 3^{16} and Jn 15^{16}): this form, well known in Homer, survives in Bœotian and Delphian inscriptions, as Michel 1411 (ii/B.C., Delphi), 1409 (*do*).[4] It is quite intelligible that NW Greek (cf above, p. 36 f.) should have thus contributed to the Κοινή an item which (like other contributions from a single quarter, *e.g.* τέσσαρες acc.) kept only a precarious existence by the side of other forms. We return to this later (pp. 193 f.). From οἶδα we have in papyri, as in NT, ordinary perfect indic. flexion,[5] and pluperf. for ᾔδειν, with occasional literary revival of the older irregular forms. Finally, in the conjugation of εἰμί, the middle forms are well established (*ἤμην*, *ἤμεθα*—see above, p. 37), as to a still further extent in MGr. Even the MGr present *εἶμαι* is found already in a Phrygian inscription *ap.* Ramsay *C. and B.* ii. 565 (early iv/A.D.). G. Meyer (^{3} 569) regarded *ἔσται* as the 3rd sing. of this, transferred to future meaning. Note that the old 1st sing. *ἦν* reappears in D at Ac 20^{18}: elsewhere *ἤμην* stands alone. The rarer *ἤτω* alternates with *ἔστω*, in papyri and late inscriptions, as in NT.

---

[1] See below, p. 234.

[2] The form -στάνω in ℵ and D (p. 175) is interesting in that it exactly anticipates the MGr. So NP 53 (iii/A.D.), in Wilcken's reading; *Syll.* 737^{76} (ii/A.D.)

[3] So in 2nd person also, ἀποδοῖς Lk 12^{59} D (as papyri).

[4] See G. Meyer ^{3} 656. Witkowski, p. xxii, reads ἀποδούηι (subj.) in Par P 58.

[5] Probably Ionic: so Herodotus, and even our texts of Homer (*Od.* i. 337).

Miscellaneous. It is needless to add any details as to noteworthy forms among the "principal parts" of verbs. Papyrus parallels may be cited for *ἠνοίγην*, for the double formation of *ἁρπάζω* and *βαστάζω* (*ἡρπάγην* and *ἡρπάσθην*, *ἐβάστασα* and *ἐβάσταξα*[1]), for the alternative perf. of *τυγχάνω* (see Ti on Heb 8^6), for the 1 aor. of *ἄγω*, etc. Note especially the intrusion of the *μ* from the present of *λαμβάνω* into various parts of the verb, and into derivative nouns (p. 149). This is normal in the papyri after the Ptolemaic period, in which there is still some lingering of the older forms. The same phenomenon occurred partially in Ionic; but the Ionic fut. *λάμψομαι*, by taking over the *ᾰ* as well as the nasal of the present, shows that it was an independent development in the *Κοινή*. This will serve as a final example to show that the late uncials and cursives, in restoring classical forms which the best MSS set aside, were deserting the Greek of the NT period in the interests of an artificial grammar.

---

[1] So P 1 38 (? rightly) in Rev 2^2; cf *δυσβάστακτος* Lk 11^{46}. It is MGr.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—Superficially parallel with *τέσσερα*, etc. is the curious variant *ἐκαθερίσθη*, which in Mk $1^{41f.}$ immediately follows *καθαρίσθητι*. WH (*App.*^{2} 157) note that this occurs only in augmented or reduplicated tense-forms: so also in LXX (Thackeray). Clearly the *ε* came in as a second augment, following what looked like *κατά*. For the itacism of *αι* and *ε* (WH *ib.*), cf Mayser 107, who shows that the change of *αι* was illiterate, and quite rare in Ptolemaic times. Later it became normal, till *αι* and *ε* were only distinguished orthographically. Mr Thackeray sends me statistics as to *οὐθείς*, supplementing the tables of Mayser (pp. 180 ff.). The phenomenon seems to be of Attic origin, appearing early in iv/B.C. Thence it spread to the Κοινή, where in ii/B.C. it greatly predominated. But in i/A.D. *οὐδείς* was markedly recovering, and before iii/A.D. it had driven out *οὐθείς*. The survival of *οὐθείς* in NT uncials is therefore significant. The compound *ἐξουθενεῖν*, born perhaps in ii/B.C., is found in the more literary LXX writers, and in Luke and Paul: the later LXX books show *ἐξουδενοῦν* coined when *οὐδείς* was reasserting itself. The 3 pl. opt. in *-σαν* may be noted in D (Ac 17^{27} *bis*). The agreement of D with the LXX in a formation markedly absent from the NT is curious; but it must not (says Dr Thumb) be used to support any theory of Egyptian origin for the MS.

CHAPTER IV.

SYNTAX : THE NOUN.

Number :—

The Dual. Neuter Plurals.

WE address ourselves to the syntax, beginning with that of the Noun. There are grammatical categories here that scarcely ask for more than bare mention. On the subject of *Number* there is one obvious thing to say—the dual has gone. Many Greek dialects, Ionic conspicuously, had discarded this hoary luxury long before the Common Greek was born; and no theory of the relation of the *Κοινή* to the dialects would allow Attic to force on the resultant speech a set of forms so useless as these. The dual may well have arisen in prehistoric days when men could not count beyond two; and it is evidently suffering from senile decay in the very earliest monuments we possess of Indo-Germanic language. It had somewhat revived in Attic—witness the inscriptions, and folk-songs like the "Harmodius"; but it never invaded Hellenistic, not even when a Hebrew dual might have been exactly rendered by its aid. We shall see when we come to the adjectives that the disappearance of the distinction between duality and plurality had wider results than the mere banishment of the dual number from declensions and conjugations. The significant new flexion of *δύο* should be noted here: there is a pluralised dative *δυσί*, but in other respects *δύο* is indeclinable. *Ἄμφω* has disappeared in favour of the normally declined *ἀμφότερος*. Apart from this matter the only noteworthy point under Number is the marked weakening of the old principle that neuter plurals (in their origin identical with collectives in -*a*[1]) took a singular verb. In the NT we have a large extension of what in classical Greek was a comparatively rare licence, the plural verb being allowed when the individual items in the subject are separately in view, while the singular treats the subject as a collective unity.[1] The liberty of using the plural freely makes the use of the singular distinctly more significant than it could be in classical Greek.

---

[1] See Giles, *Manual*^{2}, 264 ff. I might add here that Dr Giles thinks the dual may have been originally a specialised form of the plural, used (as in Homer always) to describe natural or artificial *pairs*. That this is its earliest

"Pindaric" Construction. It may be added that the converse phenomenon, known as the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*, is found in the NT: see Mk 4^{41}, Mt 5^{18} 6^{19}, 1 Co 15^{50}, Rev 9^{12}. It is really only a special case of anacoluthon, no more peculiar to Pindar than to Shakspere. An interesting communication by Prof. Skeat to the Cambridge Philological Society (*Proceedings*, lxvii. p. 2) describes a rule in English, from Alfred downwards, that "when a verb occurs in the 3rd person in an introductory manner . . ., it is often used in the singular number, though the subject may be in the plural." Thus "what *cares* these roarers for the name of king?"—"and now *abideth* faith, hope, [love], these three,"—etc.; the last being as true to English idiom as to its original Greek. That the construction is also possible with order inverted, is shown by another citation, "For thy three thousand ducats here *is* six." (See also p. 234.)

Impersonal Plural. An idiomatic use of the plural appears in passages like Mt 2^{20} *τεθνήκασιν*, Lk 12^{20} *αἰτοῦσιν*, where there is such a suppression of the subject in bringing emphasis on the action, that we get the effect of a passive, or of French *on*, German *man*. Our "they say" is like it. Lightfoot compares the "rhetorical plural" in Euripides *IT* 1359, *κλέπτοντες ἐκ γῆς ξόανα καὶ θυηπόλους* (*i.e.* Iphigenia). Add Livy ix. 1, "*auctores* belli [one man] dedidimus." Winer gives other parallels, but rightly refuses to put Mt 9^{8} 27^{44}, 1 Co 15^{29} 16^{3} into this category. If Heb 10^{1} has not a primitive error (as Hort suspected), the plural subject of *προσφέρουσιν*

---

extant use is certain, but its origin may very well have been as suggested above. There are savages still who cannot count beyond two: see Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 242 f. The Indo-Germans had numerals up to 100 before their separation; but the superfluous dual, I suggest, had been already utilised for a new purpose.

[1] This is conspicuous in D (Wellh. 12).

and *δύνανται* might fairly be described in this way; for the priests are certainly not prominent in the writer's thought, and a passive construction would have given the meaning exactly. So Westcott (for *προσφ.*) who quotes Jn 15^6 20^2, Rev 12^6, Mt 7^{16}, Mk 10^{13}, Lk 17^{23}. See also p. 163, n.^{2}.

Gender:— On *Gender* likewise there is not much to say. There are sundry differences in the gender of particular words; but even MGr is nearly as much under the domination of this outworn excrescence on language as was its classical ancestor. That English should still be almost the only European language to discard gender, indicating only distinction of sex, is exceedingly strange. As in the case of Number, we have to refer to ordinary grammars for some uses of gender which NT Greek shares with the classical. One or two cases of slavish translation should be mentioned. In Rom 11^4 the LXX *τῷ Βάαλ* is cited as *τῇ Β.*, which occurs however three times in LXX, and in *Ascensio Isaiae* 12. Prof. F. C. Burkitt (*CR* xiv. 458), in commenting on this last passage, accepts the explanation that the gender is determined by the *Q'rî* בֹּשֶׁת, translated *αἰσχύνη*. In Mk 12^{11} and Mt 21^{42} we have the LXX *αὕτη* = זֹאת: the translators may perhaps have interpreted their own Greek by recalling *κεφαλὴν γωνίας*. **Breach of Concord.** Breach of concord in Gender has been already alluded to in a note on the Greek of Rev (p. 9).[a] The very difficult *εἴ τις σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί* of Phil 2^1 comes in here, involving as it does both number and gender. We might quote in illustration Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) *ἐπί τι μίαν τῶν . . . οἰκιῶν*, and BU 326 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ δέ τι περισσὰ γράμματα . . . καταλίπω.*[b] But Blass's *εἴ τι*, read throughout, is a great improvement: *si quid valet* is the sense required, as Lightfoot practically shows by his translation. H. A. A. Kennedy (*EGT in loc.*) makes independently the same suggestion. Note that the Codex Amiatinus (and others) read *si quid viscera.* [a b See p. 244.

A significant remark may be quoted from the great Byzantinist, K. Krumbacher, *à propos* of these breaches of concord. In his *Problem d. neugr. Schriftsprache* (p. 50) he observes: "If one finds in Greek literature, between the early Byzantine age and the present day, mistakes like *λεαινῶν μὴ συγχωρούντων, φυλαὶ καταλαβόντες, πάντων τῶν γυναικῶν,* etc., it shows that we have to do with a half-dead form, in which mistakes slip in as soon as grammatical vigilance nods." When we remember that the MGr present participle, *e.g.* δένοντας, is as indeclinable as our own equivalent "binding," we can see some reason for the frequency of non-agreement in this part of the verb. What became common in the early Byzantine literature would naturally be incipient in the vernacular of imperfectly educated persons centuries before, like the author of Rev.[1] A few nouns wavering in gender may be named. *Λιμός* is masculine in Par P 22 (ii/B.C.) and feminine in 26, which is written by the same hand; further parallels need not be sought for the inconsistency between Lk 4^{25} and Ac 11^{28}, Lk 15^{14}. The apparently purposeless variation between ἡ θεός and ἡ θεά in Ac 19 is explained by inscriptions.[2] Some masculine -ος nouns like ἔλεος, ἦχος, πλοῦτος, passed into the neuter declension in Hellenistic, and remain there in MGr: see Hatzidakis, pp. 356 ff.

Case:— Disappearance of the Local Cases.

We are free now to examine the phenomena of *Case*. To estimate the position of Hellenistic cases along the line of development, we may sum up briefly what may be seen at the two ends of this line. MGr has only the three cases we ourselves possess—nominative, accusative, and genitive. (The survival of a few vocative forms, in which MGr and Hellenistic are on practically the same footing, does not affect this point, for the vocative is not really a case.) At the very dawn of Greek language history, as we know it, there is only one more, the dative, though we can detect a few moribund traces of instrumental, locative, and ablative. For all practical purposes, we may say that Greek lost in pre-

---

[1] Cf Reinhold 57 f., and p. 234 below. We may cite typical breaches of concord from the papyri. Firstly, case:—KP 37 (ii/A.D.) Ἥρων ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ειδὼς γρ(άμματα):—this is quite true as it stands, but Heron meant ειδότος! So BU 31 (εἰδός!). BU 1002 (i/B.C.) Ἀντιφίλου Ἕλλην . . . ἱππάρχης. *Letr.* 149 (ii/A.D.) τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ . . . ὁ διάτοχος (=διαδ.). OP 527 (ii–iii/A.D.) περὶ Σερήνου τοῦ γναφέως ὁ συνεργαζόμενος.[a] Then gender:—BU 997 (ii/B.C.) τὴν ὑπάρχον αὐτῶι οἰκίαν. *Ib.* 577 (iii/A.D.) ἐκ τῆς μετηλλαχότος γυναῖκαν. *Ib.* 1013 (i/A.D.) ἡ ὁμολογῶν. *Ib.* 1036 (ii/A.D.) στολὴν λεινοῦν. LP*u* (ii/B.C.) τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἄνασσον ἀκούσαντα. AP 113 (ii/A.D.) ὁ τετελευτηκὼς αὐτῆς μήτηρ.

[2] Cf Blass on 19^{27}: "Usitate dicitur ἡ θεός (ut v.^{37}); verum etiam inscriptio Ephesia . . . τῇ μεγίστῃ θεᾷ Ἐφεσίᾳ Ἀρτέμιδι, cum alibi . . . ἡ θεός eadem dicatur. . . Itaque formulam sollemnem ἡ μεγάλη θεὰ Ἄ. mira diligentia L. conservavit."[b]

[a b] See p. 244.

Encroachment of Prepositions.

historic times three out of the primitive seven cases (or eight, if we include the vocative), viz., the *from* case (ablative), the *with* case (instrumental[1]), and the *at* or *in* case (locative), all of which survived in Sanskrit, and appreciably in Latin, though obscured in the latter by the formal syncretism of ablative, instrumental, and (except in singular of *-ā-* and *-o-* nouns) locative. In other words, the purely local cases, in which the meaning could be brought out by a place-adverb (for this purpose called a preposition), sacrificed their distinct forms and usages.[2] Greek is accordingly marked, like English, by the very free use of prepositions. This characteristic is most obviously intensified in Hellenistic, where we are perpetually finding prepositional phrases used to express relations which in classical Greek would have been adequately given by a case alone. It is needless to illustrate this fact, except with one typical example which will fitly introduce the next point to be discussed. We have already (pp. 11 f.) referred to the instrumental ἐν, formerly regarded as a translation of the familiar Hebrew בְּ, but now well established as vernacular Greek of Ptolemaic and later times. The examples adduced all happen to be from the category "armed with"; but it seems fair to argue that an instrumental sense for ἐν is generally available if the context strongly pleads for it, without regarding this restriction or assuming Hebraism.[3] Nor is the intrusion of ἐν exclusively a feature of "Biblical" Greek, in the places where the prep. seems to be superfluous. Thus in Gal 5[1] the simple dative appears with ἐνέχομαι: Par P 63 (ii/B.C.—a royal letter) gives us τοὺς ἐνεσχημένους ἔν τισιν ἀγνοήμασιν. In Par P 22 (ii/B.C.) we have τῷ λιμῷ διαλυθῆναι, while the contemporary 28 has διαλυόμεναι ἐν τῷ λιμῷ. What gave birth to this extension of the uses of ἐν? It seems certainly to imply a growing lack of clearness in the simple dative, resulting in an unwillingness to trust it to express the required meaning without further definition. We may see in the multiplied use of prepositions an incipient symptom of that simplification of cases which culminates in the abbreviated case system of to-day.

---

[1] The instrumental proper all but coincided with the dative in form throughout the sing. of the 1st and 2nd decl., so that the still surviving dative of instrument may in these declensions be regarded as the ancient case: the *comitative* "with," however, was always expressed by a preposition, except in the idiom *αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσι*, and the "military dative.'

[2] Note that the *to* case also disappeared, the "terminal accusative" seen in *ire Romam.* The surviving Greek cases thus represent purely grammatical relations, those of subject, object, possession, remoter object, and instrument.

[3] I should not wish to exclude the possibility that this *ἐν*, although correct vernacular Greek, came to be used rather excessively by translators from Hebrew, or by men whose mother tongue was Aramaic. The use would be explained on the same lines as that of *ἰδού* on p. 11.

Decay of the Dative:—

The NT student may easily overlook the fact that the dative has already entered the way that leads to extinction. I take a page at random from Mk in WH, and count 21 datives against 23 genitives and 25 accusatives. A random page from the Teubner Herodotus gives me only 10, against 23 and 29 respectively; one from Plato 11, against 12 and 25. Such figures could obviously prove nothing conclusive until they were continued over a large area, but they may be taken as evidence that the dative is not dead yet. Taking the NT as a whole, the dative with prepositions falls behind the accusative and genitive in the proportion 15 to 19 and 17 respectively. This makes the dative considerably more prominent than in classical and post-classical historians.[1] The preponderance is, however, due solely to ἐν, the commonest of all the prepositions, outnumbering εἰς by about three to two: were both these omitted, the dative would come down to 2½ in the above proportion, while the accusative would still be 10. And although ἐν has greatly enlarged its sphere of influence[2] in the NT as compared with literary *Κοινή*, we

Uses with Prepositions.

---

[1] Helbing, in Schanz's *Beiträge*, No. 16 (1904), p. 11, gives a table for the respective frequency of dat., gen., and accus. with prepositions, which works out for Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, taken together, at 1 : 1·2 : 3; for twelve post-classical historians, from Polybius to Zosimus, at 1 : 1·5 : 2·4.

[2] This is well seen by comparing the statistics of Helbing, pp. 8 f. He gives the figures for the three favourite prepositions of the historians. Ἐν is one of the three in every author except Polybius, Diodorus, and Josephus; εἰς falls out of the list in Eusebius only. The total occurrences of εἰς in the three classical historians amount to 6,531, those of ἐν to 6,031; while in the twelve Hellenistic writers εἰς comes to 31,651, and ἐν to only 17,130. Contrast the NT, where εἰς is preferred to ἐν only in Mk and Heb, and the total occurrences amount to 1,743 and 2,698 respectively. See the list in p. 98 below: note there also the

find very clear examples of *εἰς* encroaching on its domain.[a] There are many NT passages where a real distinction between *εἰς* and *ἐν* is impossible to draw without excessive subtlety, for which all the motive is gone when we find in MGr *στό* with accusative (= *εἰς τόν*) the substitute for the now obsolete dative; while the language in its intermediate stages steadily tends towards this ultimate goal.[1] By the side of this we may put the disappearance of *ὑπό* with the dative, the accusative serving to express both motion and rest: in the classical historians the dative is nearly as frequent as the accusative, and some of their successors, notably Appian and Herodian, made it greatly outnumber its rival—see Helbing, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Similarly *πρός* with dative stands in NT in the ratio of less than ·01 to *πρός* with accusative: in the three classical historians it averages nearly ·12; in the later twelve, ·01 again. *'Επί* and *παρά* are the only prepositions in which the use with three cases is really alive; and even *ἐπί* rather illustrates our tendency than contradicts it—see p. 107.

Other cases substituted.

We pass on to other symptoms of senescence in the dative. In the papyri there are some clear examples of an accusative expressing point of time instead of duration (see *CR* xviii. 152); and in Ac 20^{16} and Jn 4^{52}, Rev 3^{3} we may recognise the same thing.[2] Of course the dative of "time when" was still very much more common. There were not wanting, indeed, instances where a classical use of the accusative, such as that of specification (Goodwin *Greek Gram.* § 1058), has yielded to a dative of reference (instrumental).[3] We have examples of its survival in Jn 6^{10} *al* (WM 288 f.); but, as in the papyri, the dative is very much commoner. The evidence of the decay of the dative was examined with great minuteness by F. Krebs in his three pamphlets, *Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gräcität* (1887–1890). He deals only

---

marked drop in the total for *ἐπί*, which in the twelve writers of literary *Κοινή* comes not far behind *ἐν* (14,093).

[1] See below, p. 234.

[2] Thus OP 477 (ii/A.D.) *τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος*, "in the fifth year"—a recurrent formula. Add Gen 43^{16} (Dieterich, *Unters.* 151). With *ὥραν*, however, the use began in classical times: see Blass 94. See also p. 245.

[3] Cf *CR* xv. 438, xviii. 153, and the useful *Program* by Compernass, *De Sermone Gr. Volg. Pisidiae Phrygiaeque meridionalis*, pp. 20 f. [[a] See p. 245.

with the literary *Κοινή*; but we may profitably take up his points in order and show from the NT how these tendencies of the artificial dialect are really derived from the vernacular. Krebs starts with verbs which are beginning to take the accusative, having been confined to the dative in the earlier language. The distinction in meaning between transitive verbs and verbs whose complement was properly instrumental (as with *χρᾶσθαι*—which itself takes an abnormal accus. in 1 Co 7^{31}),[a] or the dative of person interested, inevitably faded away with time, and the grammatical distinction became accordingly a useless survival. Of Krebs' exx., *πολεμεῖν* takes accus. also in vernacular, *ἐνεδρεύειν* and *εὐδοκεῖν* in the NT; but *ξενίζεσθαι, ἀπαντᾶν* and *ὑπαντᾶν* retain the dative there.[1] The movement was accompanied with various symptoms of reaction. *Προσκυνεῖν* in the NT takes the dative about twice as often as the accusative.[2] The phrase *παραβάλλεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ* (Polybius) is matched in respect of its innovating dative by *παραβολεύεσθαι* in Phil 2^{30}. We will dismiss the decay of the dative with the remark that the more illiterate papyri and inscriptions decidedly show it before the NT had acquired any antiquity. The schoolboy of OP 119, referred to already (p. 28), uses *σέ* for *σοί* after *γράφω*; while later samples (see *CR* as above) include such monstrosities as *τίνι λόγου, σὺν τῶν υἱῶν, χαρίζετε ἐμοῦ.*[3][b] Dittenberger would actually recognise the same thing in *OGIS* 17 *Ἀθηνᾶι Σωτείρᾳ Νίκῃ καὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου.* But at the beginning of iii/B.C. this confusion is surely unthinkable, and there is a curious asyndeton left: should the *καί* be transposed?[4] Even OP 811 (A.D. 1), *εὐχαριστῶν Ἑρμίππου*, seems much too early to be intentional. We may follow Krebs further as he shows the encroachments of the accusative upon the genitive, and upon the field of verbs which were formerly intransitive. It will be seen that the

---

[1] Also, we may add, *πειθαρχεῖν*, which takes a gen. (like *ἀκούω*) in Tb P 104 (i/B.C.), OP 265 (i/A.D.), and the "Gadatas" inscr. (Michel 32). For the dat., as in NT, cf *Magn.* 114, etc. *Εὐδοκεῖν* c. acc. is only in a quotation (Mt 12^{18}).

[2] Contrast the inscriptions: see *CR* xv. 436. But note Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) *ἵνα προσκυνήσῃς αὐτόν.*

[3] See other exx. in Dieterich, *Unters.* 150.

[4] D.'s further ex., No. 87 (iii/B.C.) *ὑπὲρ βασιλέως . . . καὶ βασιλίσσης . . . καὶ Πτολεμαίωι τῶι υἱῶι* seems merely a mason's carelessness. See his note on No. 364 (18 B.C.), and exx. in his Index, p. 238.

[[a] [b] See p. 245.

NT does not tally in details with the literary *Κοινή*, though it independently shows the same tendencies at work.

Accusative gains from genitive,

In his second part Krebs turns to the genitive. The first verb in which we are interested is the late compound ἀπελπίζειν, which generally takes acc. instead of the natural gen. This it seems to do in Lk 6^{35}, if we read *μηδένα* with ℵ etc. and the Lewis Syriac:[1] so Ti WHmg RVmg. *Κρατεῖν* (Krebs ii. 14) takes the gen. only 8 times in NT, out of 46 occurrences, but διαφέρειν ("surpass") has gen. always. *Ἐντρέπεσθαι* (p. 15) takes only the acc.,[2] and so does κληρονομεῖν. *Δράσσομαι* (p. 17) has the acc. in the only place where it occurs (1 Co 3^{19}, altered from LXX). *Ἐπιθυμῶ* may be added to this list, if we may follow BD *al.* in Mt 5^{28}. Add likewise the sporadic exx. of acc. with verbs of filling (Rev 17^3 *al.*; see Blass 102): Thumb observes (*ThLZ* xxviii. 422) that the usage lives on in MGr.[3] There follows a category

from intransitive construction,

of intransitive verbs which in Hellenistic have begun to take a direct object in the acc. Of these we recognise as NT examples ἐνεργεῖν (six times), συνεργεῖν (in Rom 8^{28} AB and Origen), πλεονεκτεῖν (four times, and once in passive), and χορηγεῖν.

and from dat. and gen. after compounds.

The third part of Krebs' work deals with compound verbs and their cases. Here προσφωνεῖν c. acc. may claim Lk 6^{13}, but it has the dat. four times; ὑποτρέχειν has acc. in its only occurrence; ἐπέρχεσθαι has only dat. or prepositional phrase; καταβαρεῖν occurs once, c. acc.; καταλαλεῖν takes gen. in NT, but is once passive, as is καταπονεῖν in its two occurrences; while κατισχύειν shows no sign of the acc. construction.

Limits of the blurring of old distinctions.

It would of course be easy to supplement from the NT grammar these illustrations of a general tendency, but exhaustive discussion is not needed here. We must proceed to note a few special characteristics of the individual cases as they appear in NT Greek, in uses deviating from earlier language. Before doing so, however, we must make some general observations, by way of applying to noun syntax the principles noted above, p. 20. We should not assume, from the evidence just presented as to variation of case with verbs, that the old distinctions of case-meaning have vanished, or that we may treat as mere equivalents those constructions which are found in common with the same word. The very fact that in Jn 4²³ προσκυνεῖν is found with dat. and then with acc. is enough to prove the existence of a difference, subtle no doubt but real, between the two, unless the writer is guilty of a most improbable slovenliness. The fact that the maintenance of an old and well-known distinction between the acc. and the gen. with ἀκούω saves the author of Ac 9⁷ and 22⁹ from a patent self-contradiction, should by itself be enough to make us recognise it for Luke, and for other writers until it is proved wrong. So with the subtle and suggestive variation in Heb 6⁴ᶠ· from gen. to acc. with γεύεσθαι.[1][a] Further, the argument that because εἰς often denotes rest *in* or *at*, and sometimes represents that motion *towards* (as distinguished from motion *to*) which may perhaps have been the primitive differentia of the dat., therefore it is immaterial whether εἰς or ἐν or the simple dat. be used with any particular word, would be entirely unwarrantable. It depends upon the character of the word itself. If its content be limited, it may well happen that hardly any appreciable difference is made by placing it in one or another of certain nearly equivalent relations to a noun. But if it is a word of large content and extensive use, we naturally expect to find these alternative expressions made use of to define the different ideas connected with the word they qualify, so as to set up a series of phrases having a perfectly distinct meaning. In such a case we should expect to see the original force of these expressions, obsolete in contexts where there was no-

---

[1] Μηδέν, if not to be read μηδέν', is an internal accus., *nil desperantes.*

[2] A passage from Dionysius (Krebs 16), οὔτε θεῖον φοβηθέντες χόλον οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνην ἐντραπέντες νέμεσιν, bears a curiously close resemblance to Lk 18^2

[3] See further, p. 235.

---

[1] To illustrate with a lexical example, we need not think that the evidence which proves ἐρωτᾶν in the vernacular no longer restricted to the meaning *question* (cf *Expos.* VI. viii. 431), compromises the antithesis between the verbs in Jn 16²³, rightly given by RVmg. Our English *ask* is the complete equivalent of the Hellenistic ἐρωτᾶν ; and if we translated αἰτήσητε by some other word, say *beg* or *petition*, we should naturally take *ask* to mean *question* there. See Westcott or Milligan-Moulton *in loc.*, or Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 789.

[a] See p. 245.

Construction of πιστεύω.

thing to quicken it, brought out vividly where the need of a distinction stimulated it into new life. A critical example is afforded by the construction of πιστεύω, as to which Blass (p. 110) declares that (beside the prepositional construction, with the meaning "believe in") it takes the dat. "*passim* even in the sense 'to believe in,' as in Ac 5^{14} 18^{8}."[1] Again, p. 123, "πιστεύειν εἰς alternates with πιστ. ἐν (Mk 1^{15}) and πιστ. ἐπί, in addition to which the correct classical πιστ. τινί appears." Let us examine this. In classical Greek, as LS observe, "the two notions [*believe* and *believe in*] run into each other." To be unable to distinguish ideas so vitally different in the scheme of Christianity would certainly have been a serious matter for the NT writers. Blass allows that with the preposition the meaning is *believe in.* Is this meaning ever found with the simple dat., or is πιστεύειν τινί appropriated entirely for the other idea? The answer must, it would seem, come from examination of the NT passages, rather than from outside. There are about forty occurrences of πιστεύειν with dat., apart from those where the verb means *entrust.* It will be admitted that in the great majority of these passages the meaning is *believe.* There remain a few passages where the alternative is arguable, such as Jn 5$^{24.\ 38}$ (in which the λόγος just preceding shows that *believe* is more appropriate), 8^{31} (where the variation from the previous π. εἰς cannot be merely accidental), Ac 5^{14} (where the dat. may be construed with προσετίθεντο, as in RV), 16^{34} and 18^{8} (where *accepting the truth of* God's word satisfies the connexion). (See p. 235.) It might be said that the influence of the LXX tends to weaken the normal distinction in the phrase π. τῷ θεῷ. But it is very clear that the LXX is not responsible for the NT use of πιστεύειν. The only prepositional phrase used in the LXX is that with ἐν, which is itself very rare, and this occurs in only one NT passage,[2] Mk 1^{15}, where there can be little doubt that Deissmann is right[3] in translating "believe in (the sphere of)[a] the

---

[1] The second passage is dropped in ^{2}, but not in the English edition.

[2] Eph 1^{13} is only an apparent exception, for the second ἐν ᾧ is assimilated to the first, and its sense is determined by ἐσφραγίσθητε. (II. ἐπί σε in Wis 12^{2}.)

[3] *In Christo* 46 f. Cf Gal 3^{21} (B) ἐν νόμῳ.

[[a] See p. 245.

Gospel": he compares 1 Th 3[2], Rom 1[9], 2 Co 8[18] 10[14], etc The construction πιστ. ἐπί, which outside John is commoner than εἰς, is found in Is 28[16], where B omits ἐπί, and conformity to the NT application of the passage may well have occasioned its insertion in אAQ. It would seem therefore as if the substitution of εἰς or ἐπί for the simple dative may have obtained currency mainly in Christian circles, where the importance of the difference between mere belief (הֶאֱמִין לְ) and personal trust (ה" בְּ) was keenly realised. The prepositional construction was suggested no doubt by its being a more literal translation of the Hebrew phrase with בְּ. But in itself it was entirely on the lines of development of the Greek language, as we have seen. There was, moreover, a fitness in it for the use for which it was specialised. To repose one's trust *upon* God or Christ was well expressed by πιστεύειν ἐπί, the dative suggesting more of the state, and the accusative more of the initial act of faith; while εἰς recalls at once the bringing of the soul *into* that mystical union which Paul loved to express by ἐν Χριστῷ. But as between ἐπί and εἰς, we may freely admit that it is not safe to refine too much: the difference may amount to little more than that between our own *believe on* and *believe in*.[1] The really important matter is the recognition of a clear distinction between *believe on* or *in* and *believe* with the dative simply.[2]

---

[1] For a closely allied equivalence, cf that of ἐν and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, as demonstrated by Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu* (1903), I. ch. i.

[2] We may give a table of the constructions of πιστεύω, when not absolute, and not=*entrust*. As elsewhere, it depends on WH text, ignoring passages in [[ ]].

	c. εἰς	*c.* ἐπί		*c.* ἐν	*c.* dat.	Total.
		dat.	acc.			
Mt	1	—	1	—	4	6
Mk	—	—	—	1	1	2
Lk and Ac . .	3	1	4	—	9	17
Jn and 1 Jn. .	37	—	—	—	18	55
Paul	3	4	2	—	6	15
Jas	—	—	—	—	1	1
1 Pet	1	1	—	—	—	2
Total .	45	6	7	1	39	98

1 Jn 4[16] is omitted, as ἐγνώκαμεν determines the construction; also Ac 5[14] and Eph 1[13], for reasons given above. See Thumb, *Neue Jahrb.* 1906, p. 253.

Special uses of the Cases:— Nominative. We have still to gather some noteworthy points in the use of the cases, particularly the Nominative, on which nothing has been said hitherto. The case has a certain tendency to be residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by other cases. We have its use as the name-case, unaltered by the construction of the sentence, in Rev 9^{11}: the fact that this has classical parallels (see Blass 85) is perhaps only accidental, for we have already seen that ungrammatical nominatives are prevalent in Rev (see p. 9), and the general NT usage is certainly assimilation (Mt 1^{21}, Mk 3^{16}, Ac 27^{1}). The classical parallels may serve for a writer such as Luke, if we are to write ἐλαιών in Lk 19^{29} 21^{37}. In WH and the RV it is ἐλαιῶν, gen. pl., and so Blass. We noted above (p. 49) the conclusive evidence which compels us to accept the noun ἐλαιών, *olivetum*, as a word current in the *Κοινή*. WH (*App*^{2} 165) regard the presence of *Ἐλαιῶνος* in Ac 1^{12} as corroborating the argument drawn from the unambiguous τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. Tertullian's *in Elaeonem secedebat*, the prevalence of *olivetum* in the Latin versions, and the new fact (unknown to WH) that ἐλαιών is a word abundantly occurring in the vernacular, may together perhaps incline us rather to the other view, with Deissmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Weiss (cf W. F. Moulton's note in WM 227). Certainly, if we were forced to emend on conjecture, to substitute *Ἐλαιῶνα* in Lk *ll.cc.*—in one of which places the initial ἀ. following makes it especially easy—would cause much less disturbance than to force Blass's ἐλαιῶν upon Acts and Josephus. (See further on p. 235.)

"Nominativus Pendens." The nominative which stands at the head of a clause without construction is a familiar phenomenon hardly needing to be illustrated: it is one of the easiest of anacolutha, and as much at home in English as in Greek. The special case in which the participle is concerned will engage our attention later (p. 225). Typical exx. are Lk 21^{6}, Ac 7^{40}, Mt 5^{40} D (ὁ θέλων . . . ἄφες αὐτῷ—a plausible reading, as τῷ θέλοντι is an easy correction), 1 Jn 2^{24}, Rev 2^{26}, etc. Note Mt 17^{14} and Mk 1^{34} in D.

The parenthetic nominative in expressions of time is well seen in Mt 15^{32}, Mk 8^{2}, also Lk 9^{28}. In popular Attic the construction goes as far back as v/B.C.[1] Viteau (*Sujet* 41) cites

Parenthetic Nominative. Eccles 2^{16} (note emendation in A and $\aleph^{c.\,a.}$) and Jos 1^{11}. On the latter Nestle notes (*Exp T* xvi. 429) that B (ἔτι ἡμέραι τρεῖς καὶ διαβαίνετε) gives the rationale.[a] Deissmann adds from the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (in OP i. p. 9) ἡμέραι γὰρ ἤδη τρεῖς καὶ νύκτες τρεῖς Θέκλα οὐκ ἐγήγερται.[2] We must leave it an open question whether Ac 5^{7} (see p. 16) belongs to this category: it means an isolated return to the construction of ἐγένετο which Luke used in his Gospel, but then abandoned. This may not however be quite decisive. The use of parenthetic nominatives appears in the papyri most abundantly in descriptions with οὐλή or γείτονες. Thus "εἰκόνες"[2] will run, "to A., long-faced, straight-nosed, a scar on his right wrist"; and a piece of land or a house is inventoried with "belonging to A., its neighbours on the south the open street, on the west the house of B."—all nominatives without construction. We compare such examples as Jn 1^{6}.

Articular Nominative in address. There is a very marked increase in the use of the articular nominative in address. Nearly sixty examples of it are found in the NT. There seems no sufficient reason for assigning any influence to the coincident Hebrew use, for classical Greek shows the idiom well established. The rough and peremptory tone which characterises most of the other examples seems to have disappeared. Contrast the Aristophanic ὁ παῖς ἀκολούθει, "you there! the lad, I mean" (Blass), with the tender ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε[2] in Lk 8^{54}: we may still recognise a survival of the *decisiveness* of the older use. *Descriptiveness*, however, is rather the note of the articular nom. of address in the NT: so in Lk 12^{32}, Jn 19^{3}, where we may represent the *nuance* by "Fear not, you little flock!" "Hail, you 'King'!" In the latter passage we can easily feel the inappropriateness of the βασιλεῦ found in ℵ, which would admit the royal right, as in Ac 26^{7}. Its appearance in Mk 15^{18} is merely a note of the writer's imperfect sensibility to the more delicate shades of Greek idiom.

---

[1] Meisterhans³ 203. See *CR* xvii. 197, where Crönert reads in BM ii. 299 (no. 417—iv/A.D.) ἐπειδὴ ἀσχολῶ ἐλθῖν πρὸς σὲν αὐτὲ (= -αὶ) ἡμέρε, "his diebus"—a violent example if true. Cf p. 11 n.[1] *ad fin.* [[a] See p. 245.

[2] See p. 235.

Vocative. Note that Lk, and perhaps Mt (ℵAL), correct Mk here. The *anarthrous* nom. should probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative. In MGr the forms in -ε are practically the only separate vocatives surviving. Hellenistic has little more, retaining some in -*α* and -εῦ, with the isolated γύναι, πάτερ, and θύγατερ; but the nom. is beginning to assert itself even here, for πατήρ[1][a] and θυγάτηρ are well attested (see the evidence in Blass 86 n.). The vocative itself need not detain us, the presence or absence of ὦ being the only feature calling for comment. In the Lucan writings only is the interjection used in the classical manner without emphasis. Elsewhere it is mostly used as we use *O*, except that this is with us appropriate in prayer, from which it is markedly absent in the NT, though not entirely in the translation Greek of the OT. The progressive omission of ὦ is not wholly easy to explain, for the classical examples (see Gerth's Kühner³ § 357. 4) show that the simple voc. has normally a touch of dignity or reserve. A specially good ex. occurs in Plato *Crito* 52A, ταύταις δή φαμεν καὶ σέ, Σώκρατες, ταῖς αἰτίαις ἐνέξεσθαι, where "the effect of omitting ὦ is to increase the impressiveness, since ὦ Σώκρατες is the regular mode of address: in English we obtain the same effect by exactly the opposite means" (Adam). NT use has thus approximated to our own, and may well have travelled upon the same path without any outside interference, such as A. Buttmann would find in Latinism.[2]

Common to nominative and accusative is the use of εἰς with acc. to replace a predicate, in such phrases as εἶναι εἰς and ἐγείρειν εἰς (Ac 8^{23} 13^{22}). This cannot fairly be described

---

[1] There seems no adequate reason to write πάτηρ, as WH (*App*² 165).

[2] J. A. Scott, in *AJP* xxvi. 32–43, has a careful study of the classical use of ὦ. He shows that ὦ "with the vocative was familiar, and was not freely used until the familiar language of comedy, dialectic, and the law courts became the language of literature, when the vocative rarely appears without the interjection." The Attic *sermo vulgaris* in this case did not determine the usage of the Hellenistic vernacular. [[a] See p. 245.

Predicates with εἰς.

as a Hebraism, for the vernacular shows a similar extension of the old use of εἰς expressing destination: so for example KP 46 (ii/A.D.), ἔσχον παρ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα, a recurrent formula. It is obvious that "I received it *as* a loan" and "*for* a loan" do not differ except in grammar. The fact that this εἰς is mainly found in translation falls into line with other phenomena already discussed—the overdoing of a correct locution in passages based on a Semitic original, simply because it has the advantage of being a literal rendering.

Genitive.

We may pass over the accusative, as little remains to be said of it except on points of detail. As to the genitive, readers of Winer will perhaps hardly need reminding now-a-days that to call the case "unquestionably the *whence-case*" is an utterly obsolete procedure. The Greek genitive is syncretic (cf p. 61); and the ablative, the only case which answers to Winer's "case of *proceeding from* or *out of*," is responsible for a part of the uses of the genitive in which it was merged. Most of the ordinary divisions of the case we find still in extensive use. The *objective* gen. is very prominent, and exegesis has often to discuss the application of this or the subjective label to a particular phrase. It is as well to remember that in Greek this question is entirely one of exegesis, not of grammar. There is no approximation to the development by which we have restricted the inflexional genitive in our language almost entirely to the subjective use. The *partitive* gen. is largely replaced by the abl. with ἀπό or ἐκ,[a] but is still used freely, sometimes in peculiar phrases. In Mt 28[1] (RV) we have ὀψέ with this gen., "late on the sabbath:" cf Tb P 230 (ii/B.C.) ὀψίτερον τῆς ὥρας, and Par P 35, 37 (ii/B.C.) ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας, and Philostratus (*ap.* Blass^2 312) ὀψὲ τῶν Τρωικῶν, "at a late stage in the Trojan war." This last writer however has also ὀψὲ τούτων, "*after* these things," and Blass now (*l.c.*) adopts this meaning in Mt, giving other quotations. This use of ὀψέ = *after* involves an *ablative* gen., "late *from*." There remains the *vespere sabbati* of the Latt. and the Lewis Syr., favoured by Weiss, Wright, etc. Since ὀψέ could be used practically as an indeclinable noun (see Mk 11[11] *al*), this seems a natural development, but the question is not easy to decide.[1] How freely the partitive gen. was used in the *Κοινή* may be seen in passages like Ac 21^{16}, where it is subject of a sentence. See WM 253 for classical parallels: add *OGIS* 56^{59} *ὁ προφήτης ἤ τῶν . . . ἱερέων . . . οἴσει.* How unnecessary it was there for Dittenberger to insert *τις*, may be seen from the standing phrase *ὁ δεῖνα τῶν φίλων*, "X., one of the Privy Council" (as Par P 15 (ii/B.C.), etc.).

---

[a] See p. 245.

Genitive of Time and Place. The papyri show us abundantly the genitive of *time* and *place*, like *νότου* "on the south," *ἔτους β* "in the 2nd year." It comes most naturally from the simplest of all genitives, that of possession, "belonging to"; but the abl. is possible, as we find the place idea expressed in Rev 21^{13} by *ἀπὸ νότου.* "Time or place *within which*"—cf *τοῦ ὄντος μηνός* "within the current month," FP 124 (ii/A.D.)—is the normal differentia of this genitive, which has thus perhaps its closest affinity with the partitive. For *time*, this genitive is common in NT, as in phrases like *νυκτός*, *χειμῶνος*, *ὄρθρου βαθέως*, *τοῦ λοιποῦ.* For *place*, we have mostly stereotyped words and phrases like *ποίας* Lk 5^{19}, and ancient words like *αὐτοῦ*, *ποῦ.* It is strange that the commentators and grammarians have so much neglected the difficult gen. in Ac 19^{26}. Dr Knowling merely declines Hackett's suggestion that *Ἐφέσου* and *πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας* depend on *ὄχλον*, for which however we might quote a good parallel in Sophocles *OT* 236 (see Jebb). The gloss *ἕως* (D), "within," may possibly express the meaning; but the vernacular supplies no parallel, except the stereotyped phrases for points of the compass, nor was it ever normal in classical Greek after the Epic period: see the exx., nearly all poetical, in Kühner-Gerth i. 384 f. On the whole, one feels disposed to make *ὄχλον* responsible after all.

The question of Hebraism is raised again by the genitive of *definition.* Some of the "long series of phrases" coming

---

[1] See below, p. 101, for a construction which may be parallel. There is a note in Dalman's *Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram.* p. 197, in which Lightfoot's במפּקי (*Hor. Hebr.* 500) is tentatively approved as the original of *ὀψέ.* The phrase "means always the time immediately *after the close of* the Sabbath." In Mt 28^{1}, accordingly, "at most a late hour of the night would be designated: the term is impossible for dawn. A reckoning of the Sabbath from sunrise to sunrise (Weiss *in loc.*) is unheard of."

Genitive of Definition.

under this head "obviously take their origin from Hebrew," says Blass (p. 98). The poetical examples collected in Jebb's note on Sophocles, *Antig.* 114 (or more fully in Kühner-Gerth, i. 264), include some which are quite as remarkable as the "Hebraisms" quotable from the NT. Thus *καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας* (Heb 3^{12}) will pair off well with *τόσονδε τόλμης πρόσωπον* (Soph. *OT* 533). That many of these phrases really are literal translations from the Hebrew need not be questioned; and if an existing usage was available for the purpose, we can understand its being overstrained. Our only concern is with passages where no Semitic original is admissible. In these it seems fair to assume that the poetical phraseology of the Attic period had come down into the market-place, as happened also, for example, in *ἀπείραστος κακῶν* Jas 1^{13}, *ἀκαταπάστους* (p. 47) *ἁμαρτίας* 2 Pet 2^{14}, which have plentiful illustration from papyri.[1]

Genitive Absolute.

The rapid extension of the *genitive absolute* is a very obvious feature of Hellenistic Greek—so obvious, indeed, that we are not tempted to dwell on it here. In the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines. We also find there a use frequently seen in the NT—*e.g.*, in Mt 1^{18} 8^{1} 9^{18}, Mk 13^{1}, Lk 12^{36}, Ac 22^{17}, etc.—the gen. abs. referring to a noun or pronoun already in the sentence, without any effort to assimilate the cases.[2] Rarely in NT, but frequently in papyri, we find a participle standing by itself in gen. abs. without a noun or pronoun in agreement: thus Mt 17^{14}, Ac 21^{31}. A violent use occurs in Heb 8^{9} (LXX) *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου*: so Blass, but the construction was probably suggested immediately by the original Hebrew. Westcott compares Barn 2^{28} *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου αὐτῷ.* The old accus. abs., belonging to impersonal verbs, has vanished except in the word *τυχόν* "perhaps" (1 Co 16^{6}): Blass points out how Luke avoids it in Ac 23^{30}, where classical Greek would demand *μηνυθέν c. acc. et inf.* The papyri show *ἐξόντος passim* for the classical *ἐξόν, it being allowed.*

---

[1] See p. 235.

[2] Cf exx. from Polybius in Kälker 281; and below, p. 236.

Dative of Disadvantage.

One example of a noteworthy pure dative, the *dativus incommodi*, may be briefly referred to. In Rev $2^{5.16}$ *ἔρχομαί σοι* is used rather markedly in place of *ἔ. πρός σε*: a reason for the peculiar phraseology is offered in *JTS* iii. 516. It should however be added now that the very phrase occurs in a recently published papyrus, BU 1041 (ii/A.D.), an illiterate document, with context less clear than we should like. See p. 245.

Datives of time, reference, accompaniment.

Side by side with the common *locative* dative of time (point of time), we have an *instrumental* dative of extension of time, which is not always easy to distinguish from it. Thus in Lk 8^{29} *πολλοῖς χρόνοις* is "oftentimes" (loc.) in RV text, "of a long time" (instr.) in mg. The latter, which is clearly found in *χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ* Lk 8^{27}, and *χρόνοις αἰωνίοις* Rom 16^{25}, is supported by the recurring formula in private letters, *ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις*.[1] The field of accusative and instrumental is contiguous also in the "dative of reference": *γένει* in Mk 7^{26}, Ac 4^{36} *al*, as in BU 887 (ii/A.D.) *γένει Φρυγίαν*. Jn 6^{10} affords one of the few NT exx. of the acc. in similar construction. TP 1 (ii/B.C.) *προβεβηκότας ἤδη τοῖς ἔτεσιν* (class.), compared with Lk $1^{7.18}$ 2^{36}, shows how the ubiquitous *ἐν* came in with datives that did not need it: here we may presume an Aramaic background. A difficult dative in Rev 8^{4}, *ταῖς προσευχαῖς* (RV text "with the prayers," and so Milligan and Holtzmann), is probably to be taken as the sociative instrumental: cf BU 69 (ii/A.D.) *ἃς καὶ ἀποδώσω σοι τῷ ἔνγιστα δοθησομένῳ ὀψωνίῳ*, "*with* (*i.e.* at the time of) my next wages." Cf Abbott *Joh. Gr.* 519.

"Hebraic" Dative.

Finally, we may speak of one more dative use, that of which *ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε*, Mt 13^{14}, will serve as a type. In giving a list of these phrases, Blass (p. 119) remarks that "the usage is an imitation of the Hebrew infinite absolute like מוֹת יָמוּת, and is consequently found already in the LXX"; also that "the analogous classical phrases such as *γάμῳ γαμεῖν* ('in true wedlock'), *φυγῇ φεύγειν* ('to flee with all speed') are only accidentally similar to these." I should state this rather differently. It may be allowed that this construction, and that with the participle (*βλέποντες βλέψετε*) are examples of "translation Greek." But in what sense are they *imitations* of the Hebrew? It seems to me that such a description implies something much nearer and more literal, such as *ἀκούειν ἀκούσετε*.[1] Is it then mere accident that we find the Hebrew locution represented by Greek which recalls respectively the *γάμῳ γαμεῖν* and *φυγῇ φεύγειν* quoted by Blass, and the well-known Aeschylean

---

[1] W. Schulze (*Gr. Lat.* 14) would make Latin responsible for the first start of this extension. But it must be allowed that the classical phrase *τῷ χρόνῳ*, "by lapse of time," was capable of giving the impulse. For the antiquity of this instrumental, see Delbrück, *Grundr.* § 109. Cf *CR* xv. 438, xviii. 153.

> *οἳ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην,*
> *κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον* (*P.V.* 447 f.),[2]

or the *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει* of Herodotus? The Greek translator, endeavouring to be as literal as he could, nevertheless took care to use Greek that was possible, however unidiomatic [a]—a description well suiting the kind of language used in every age by translators who have gained the conscientious accuracy, but not the sure-footed freedom, of the mature scholar.

---

[1] As we actually find in Jos 17^{13} *ἐξολεθρεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐξωλέθρευσαν*. A emends *ὀλεθρεύσει.* (I owe this to Votaw, p. 56.)

[2] The idea of these words became proverbial: cf [Demosthenes] 797, *ὥστε, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὁρῶντας μὴ ὁρᾶν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν.* Of course the resemblance to Mt *l.c.* is more superficial than real, for Aeschylus means "*though* they saw, they saw in vain." But there is enough nearness to suggest the NT form as possible Greek. An exact parallel is quoted by Winer from Lucian (*Dial. Marin.* iv. 3) *ἰδὼν εἶδον*: the participle has vanished in the Teubner text, whether with or without MS authority I cannot stop to examine. It should be made penal to introduce emendations into classical texts without a footnote!

[[a] See p. 245.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—The predicative *εἰς* occurs in M. Aurelius vi. 42—see Wilamowitz, *Leseb.* ii. 198. Marcus at any rate will not be suspected of Semitism! A similar use of *ἐν* is quotable from Hb P 42 (iii/B.C.) *δώσομεν ἐν ὀφειλήματι* "*as* a debt." The freedom with which the dative was used in the days of its obsolescence may be further illustrated with vernacular exx. For the *dat. ethicus* cf *ἔρρωσό μοι*, Tb P 315, 314 (both ii/A.D). *Dat. commodi*, BM iii. p. 1 (iii/B.C.) compel him *ἐκχωρῆσαί μοι τῶν ἐμῶν μερῶν.* The instrumental of time-duration is common. So Polyb. xxxii. 12 *πολλοῖς χρόνοις.* *Syll.* 734 (ii/A.D.) *πολλοῖς ἔτεσι* (*τὸν δεῖνα*) = "long live X!" Str P 22 (iii/A.D.) *ἡ γυνὴ ἐν τῇ νομῇ γέγονεν πολλῷ χρόνῳ.* *OGIS* 710 (ii/A.D.) *χρόνῳ* [*διαφθαρὲ*]*ν ἀνώρθωσεν* (classical). Note the remarkable instr. in *Ep. Diogn.* 7, *ᾧ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἔκτισεν*: see Gildersleeve *in loc.* Instr. also is PFi 2 (iii/A.D.), we appoint X. in charge of the gaol *κινδύνῳ ἡμῶν κτλ.* Locative uses are presumable in BM iii. p. 105 (i/A.D.) *ἐὰν ἀφυστερῇ καύμασι* "is deficient *in* fuel." OP 742 (2 B.C., Witk. 94) *ἵνα τῇ ἀναβάσει αὐτὰς ἄξωμεν* (1st aor.), "at our return." In the same papyrus is a curious instrumental: *παράδος . . . ἀριθμῶι αὐτάς*, "carefully counted" (Wilcken)

CHAPTER V.

ADJECTIVES, PRONOUNS, PREPOSITIONS.

Adjectives :— "Duality,"

THERE is not much to be said under the head of Adjectives, except on the important "Duality" question raised by the phenomena of comparison. The question touches the use of dual pronouns of the ἕτερος class, as well as the relation between comparative and superlative. The abolition of a distinction between duality and plurality is almost inevitable sooner or later in language history. English affords us instructive parallels. The simplicity and convenience of our suffixes *-er* and *-est* have helped to preserve in common speech the old degrees of comparison. But how often does the man in the street say "the better of the two"? One would not like to say offhand how far in this matter modern literature is impeccable on Lindley Murray rules; but in conversation the most correct of us may at times be caught tripping, and even when the comparative is used we are most of us conscious of a kind of pedantic accuracy. That "the best of the two" is the English of the future is a fairly safe assertion. *Whether*, adjectivally, is as archaic as πότερος:[1] when we translate τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο (Mt 27^{21}) by the archaism "whether of the twain," we are only advertising the fact that the original was normal speech and our translation artificial. We have not yet arrived at "either of the three," but people say "either A. or B. or C." without a qualm. Of course the first step was taken ages ago in the extinction of the dual, the survival of which in Germanic

---

[1] In twelve papyrus collections there is *one* occurrence of πότερος in the indices, and that is nearly illegible and (to me, at least) quite unintelligible (AP 135, ii/A.D.). It is replaced by τίς already in the LXX.

in Comparison,

is evidenced, centuries after the NT, by Wulfila's Gothic. Other modern languages tell the same tale. In the NT the obsolescence of the superlative, except in the *elative* sense, is most marked. It is mere chance that only one example of the -τατος superlative has survived,[1] for there are scores of them in the papyri. Of the genuine superlative sense, however, the examples there are very rare; practically we may say that in the vernacular documents the superlative forms are used to express the sense of our "very." The confusion of comparative and superlative is well seen in some illiterate papyri, where phrases like τὸ μέγιστον καὶ γνησιώτερον occur. One or two typical examples of irregular comparatives may be cited —the references will be found, with other examples, in *CR* xv. 439 and xviii. 154. Specially instructive is the papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, written in ii/B.C. There we have καθ' ὃν ὁ ἥλιος φερόμενος τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν βραχυτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν δὲ νύκτα μακροτέραν. The context demands a superlative, and Blass no doubt rightly assumes that the author (iv/B.C.) wrote βραχυτάτην and μακροτάτην. In that case the scribe's alteration is very significant. He has in the same way altered μεγίστη to μειζόνει in another place, and he writes ἐν ἑκατέρωι τῶν ζωιδίων for "in *each* of the (twelve) signs." In Tb P 33 (ii/B.C.) we have ἐν μείζονι ἀξιώματι, an elative.[2] It is in fact clear that μέγιστος is practically obsolete in Hellenistic: its appearance in 2 Pet is as significant as its absence from the rest of the NT. The Revisers' scrupulous margin in 1 Co 13^{13} and Mt 18^{1} may be safely dispensed with, on the new evidence. Κρείττων and χείρων are always strictly comparative in NT, but they have no superlatives:[2] κράτιστος is only a title. Βελτίων[2] (in adv.) occurs once, in 2 Tim 1^{18}, but does not appear in any of Grenfell and Hunt's papyri, except in an official Ptolemaic document:[3] βέλτιστος (not in NT) has a somewhat better claim (*ter* in ii/B.C.). Ἀμείνων and ἄριστος (not NT) appear occasionally. Note especially OP 716 (ii/A.D.) τὴν ἀμείνονα

---

[1] Ac 26^{5}, in true superlative sense; this speech is much affected by literary style.

[2] See p. 236 below.

[3] Tb P 27^{80} (113 B.C.).

αἵρεσιν διδόντι, "to the *highest* bidder." Yet ἄριστος is found in OP 292 (i/A.D.), a vernacular document, but the sole witness among the papyri named. Ἐλάσσων is common, but ἐλάχιστος (a true superl. in 1 Co 15^{9}, as in Tb P 24 (ii/B.C.)—an official document, but in very bad Greek) has not wholly disappeared. Πλείων and πλεῖστος are common, but the latter is generally elative in the papyri—note however Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.) τὴν ἐσομένην πλείστην τιμήν, and other exx. which may support 1 Co 14^{27}. Mt 11^{20} may show the elative—"those very numerous mighty works"; but the other rendering is as good. In Jn 1^{15} πρῶτός μου, and 15^{18} πρῶτον ὑμῶν, we have the superlative ousting the comparative. Winer quotes Aelian (WM 306), and we can add σοῦ πρῶτός εἰμι from LP*w* (ii/iii A.D.—magic).[a] There seems no longer adequate reason to question that πρότερος has here been superseded; for the great rarity of the comparative form in the papyri reinforces the natural inference from Jn *ll.cc.* In the Grenfell-Hunt volumes it only occurs 9 times, in 7 documents. The mere use of πρῶτος in Ac 1^{1}, it must be allowed, proves very little as to the author's intention to write a third treatise. Ramsay himself (*Paul*, p. 28) admits that the absence of πρότερος from the Lucan writings precludes certainty for the hypothesis. See further p. 236.

and in Pronouns.

The case is not quite so strong for the pronouns. There are plenty of places where ἕτερος, ἑκάτερος, ὁπότερος, etc., are used of more than two, and ἄλλος of two only; but also places where the pronouns are used carefully according to classical precedent. It seems a fair assumption that these words held much the same relative position as was described just now for our own comparative and superlative in phrases like "the better (best) of two." Educated men would know the distinction and observe it, unless off their guard. In these cases we must let the context decide, paying due attention to the degree of grammatical precision usually attained by each several author. It is remarkable that in this respect we find Luke by no means particular. In Lk 8^{6-8} he actually substitutes ἕτερος for the correct ἄλλος which appears in his presumed source, Mk 4^{5-8} (cf Mt 13^{5-8}); and in Lk 6^{29} he does not alter τὴν ἄλλην (σιαγόνα !) which appears also in Mt 5^{39}, but is corrected in Clem. Hom. 15^{8}. This will clearly need remembering when we examine other "dual" words in Luke.[1] See pp. 245f.

---

[a] See p. 245.

'Αμφότεροι = all?

A difficulty under this head is raised by Ac 19^{16}. The probability that *ἀμφότεροι* was used for *πάντες* in BM 336 (ii/A.D.), and two clear examples of it in NP 67 and 69 (iv/A.D.),[2] with the undeniable Byzantine use, form a strong temptation where the relief would be so great.[3] I cannot but think that Ramsay is quite right in saying (*Paul*, p. 272), "The seven sons in v.^{14} change in an unintelligible way to two in v.^{16} (except in the Bezan text)." Luke must have been a very slovenly writer if he really meant this, and the Bezan reading of v.^{14} does not help us to understand how the more difficult "neutral text" arose if it really was secondary. On the other hand, Luke is one of the last NT writers whom we should expect to fall into a colloquialism of which early examples are so rare: that he shares the loose use of *ἕτερος*, etc., current in his time, does nothing to mitigate this improbability. If we are to defend these verses from Ramsay's criticisms—and in a purely grammatical discussion we cannot deal with them except on this side—must we not assume that the original text of v.^{14} is lost?[a] If this contained a fuller statement, the abruptness of *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρόν* in v.^{14}, and of our *ἀμφοτέρων*, might be removed without compromising the characteristic *ἑπτά*: we might also have a clearer term to describe Sceva's office. The alternative is to suppose the verses an interpolation from a less educated source, which has been imperfectly adapted to Luke's style.[4]

We pass on to the Article, on which there is not very much to say, since in all essentials its use is in agreement

---

[1] Note in the Messenian *Syll.* 653^{91} (91 B.C.) *τὸν μὲν ἕνα . . . τὸν δ' ἄλλον*, of two. The aberrant *ἕτερον . . . ἄλλον* in Lk $7^{19f.}$ B is most simply explained by supposing that the scribe has found a place for two variants. If we press the reading, the messengers are represented as softening the message, no longer "another kind of Messiah," but "another of the same kind": cf Gal $1^{6f.}$. The meaning "different" naturally developed out of "the other class (of two)," and it survived when the normal use of *ἕτερος* had faded out. See also p. 246.

[2] BU 1057 (13 B.C.) must, I think, be otherwise explained.

[3] See notes in *Expos.* VI. viii. 426 and *CR* xv. 440.

[4] The Sahidic and some later versions took *ἀμφοτέρων* as "all." Were this better supported, we should find another ex. in Ac 23^{8}. Dr Nestle thinks me unduly timid as to adopting this interpretation. [[a] See p. 246.

The Article :— "Correctness" of NT Greek.

with Attic. It might indeed be asserted that the NT is in this respect remarkably "correct" when compared with the papyri. It shows no trace of the use of the article as a relative, which is found in classical Greek outside Attic, in papyri from the first,[1] and to some extent in MGr. The papyri likewise exhibit some examples of the article as demonstrative, apart from connexion with *μέν* or *δέ*,[1] whereas the NT has no ex. beyond the poetical quotation in Ac 17^{28}. Further, we have nothing answering to the vernacular idiom by which the article may be omitted between preposition and infinitive. In family or business accounts among the papyri we find with significant frequency an item of so much *εἰς πεῖν*, with the dative of the persons for whom this thoughtful provision is made. There are three passages in Herodotus where *ἀντί* behaves thus: see vi. 32, *ἀντὶ εἶναι*, with Strachan's note, and Goodwin, *MT* § 803 (see further below, p. 216). In these three points we may possibly recognise Ionic influence showing itself in a limited part of the vernacular; it is at least noteworthy that Herodotus will supply parallels for them all. The Ionic elements in the *Κοινή* were briefly alluded to above (pp. 37 f.), where other evidence was noted for the sporadic character of these infusions, and their tendency to enlarge their borders in the later development of the Common Greek.

Hebraisms?

We are not much troubled with Hebraism under the article.[2] Blass (p. 151) regards as "thoroughly Hebraic" such phrases as *πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς*; but *κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν* "is a regular phrase and perhaps not a Hebraism." Where Semitic originals lie behind our Greek, the dictum is unobjectionable; but the mere admission that *κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν* is Greek shows how slightly these phrases diverge from the spirit of the translator's language. Phrases like *τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ, διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου*. etc., are recurrent in the papyri, and the extension, such as it is, lies in the addition of a dependent genitive.[3] The principle of "correlation" (on which see the note in WM,

---

[1] See Völker 5 f.; also *CR* xviii. 155. [2] See p. 236. [3] See pp. 99 f.

p. 175) here supports the strong tendency to drop the article after a preposition. This is seen working in the papyri: cf Völker, *Der Artikel* pp. 15–17.

Anarthrous Prepositional Phrases.

Without laying down a law that the noun is naturally anarthrous when attached to a preposition, we may certainly say that the usage is so predominant that no refinements of interpretation are justifiable. Obviously ἐν οἴκῳ (Mk 2^{1}) is not "in *a* house," nor ἐν ἀγορᾷ (Lk 7^{32}) "in *a* market-place," nor ἐν ἀγυιᾷ, in the current papyrus formula, "in *a* street." We say "down town," "on 'Change," "in bed," "from start to finish."[1] If we substitute "in my bed," "from the beginning to the end," we are, it seems, more pictorial; we point, as it were, to the objects in question. There is nothing *indefinite* about the anarthrous noun there; but for some reason the qualitative aspect of a noun, rather than the deictic, is appropriate to a prepositional phrase, unless we have special reason to point to it the finger of emphatic particularisation. To this Dr Findlay adds the consideration that the phrases in question are familiar ones, in which triteness has reduced their distinctiveness, and promoted a tendency to abbreviate. It would seem that English here is on the same lines as Greek, which, however, makes the anarthrous use with prepositions much more predominant than it is with us.

Anarthrous "Headings."

Pursuing further the classes of words in which we insert *the* in translation, we have the anarthrous use "in sentences having the nature of headings" (Hort, *1 Peter*, p. 15*b*). Hort assigns to this cause the dropped articles before θεοῦ, πνεύματος and αἵματος in 1 Pet 1^{2}; Winer cites the opening words of Mt, Mk, and Rev.

Qualitative Force in Anarthrous Nouns.

The lists of words which specially affect the dropped article will, of course, need careful examination for the individual cases. Thus, when Winer includes πατήρ in his list, and quotes Jn 1^{14} and Heb 12^{7}, we must feel that in both passages the qualitative force is very apparent—

---

[1] According to Ramsay (*Paul*, p. 195), παρὰ ποταμόν, Ac 16^{13}, shows familiarity with the locality. To accept this involves giving up ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, a step not to be lightly taken. (See further, p. 236.)

"what son is there whom his father, *as a father*, does not chasten?" (On the former passage see RV margin, and the note in WM 151.) For exegesis, there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention than this omission of the article when the writer would lay stress on the quality or character of the object. Even the RV misses this badly sometimes, as in Jn 6^{68}.[1]

Proper Names. Scholarship has not yet solved completely the problem of the article with proper names. An illuminating little paper by Gildersleeve may be referred to (*AJP* xi. 483–7), in which he summarises some elaborate researches by K. Schmidt, and adds notes of his own. He shows that this use, which was equivalent to pointing at a man, was originally popular, and practically affects only prose style. The usage of different writers varies greatly; and the familiar law that the article is used of a person already named (anaphoric use), or well known already, is not uniformly observed. Deissmann has attempted to define the papyrus usage in the Berlin *Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1902, p. 1467. He shows how the writers still follow the classical use in the repetition with article of a proper name which on its first introduction was anarthrous. When a man's father's or mother's name is appended in the genitive, it normally has the article. There are very many cases where irregularities occur for which we have no explanation. See also Völker p. 9, who notes the curious fact that the names of slaves and animals receive the article when mentioned the first time, where personalities that counted are named without the article. The innumerable papyrus parallels to *Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* (Ac 13^{9}) may just be alluded to before we pass from this subject: see Deissmann *BS* 313 ff., and Ramsay, *CR* xix. 429.

Position of Article. The position of the article is naturally much affected by the colloquial character of NT language. In written style the ambiguous position of *εἰς τὸν θάνατον*, Rom 6^{4}, would have been cleared up by prefixing *τοῦ*, if the meaning was (as seems probable) "by this baptism into his death." In most cases, there is no doubt as to whether the prepositional phrase belongs to the neighbouring noun. A very curious misplacement of the article occurs in the ὁ ὄχλος πολύς[1] of Jn 12^9. As Sir R. C. Jebb notes on Sophocles, *OT* 1199 f., the noun and adjective may be fused into a composite idea; but Jebb's exx. (like 1 Pet 1^{18} and the cases cited in W. F. Moulton's note, WM 166) illustrate only the addition of a *second* adjective after the group article-adjective-noun (cf OP 99—i/A.D.—*τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῷ μητρικῆς οἰκίας τριστέγου*).[2] We cannot discuss here the problem of Tit 2^{13}, for we must, as grammarians, leave the matter open: see WM 162, 156 n. But we might cite, for what they are worth, the papyri BU 366, 367, 368, 371, 395 (all vii/A.D.), which attest the translation "our great God and Saviour" as current among Greek-speaking Christians. The formula runs *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου, κτλ.* A curious echo is found in the Ptolemaic formula applied to the deified kings: thus GH 15 (ii/B.C.), *τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος [ἐπιφανοῦς] εὐχαρίστου.* The phrase here is, of course, applied to one person. One is not surprised to find that P. Wendland, at the end of his suggestive paper on *Σωτήρ* in *ZNTW* v. 335 ff., treats the rival rendering in Tit *l.c.* summarily as "an exegetical mistake," like the severance of *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* and *σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χ.* in 2 Pet 1^1. Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland's contention that Christians, from the latter part of i/A.D. onward, deliberately annexed for their Divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men.

---

[1] The marginal reading stood in the text in the First Revision. It is one among very many places where a conservative minority damaged the work by the operation of the two-thirds rule.

Personal Pronouns:— "Semitic Redundance."

From the Article we turn to the Personal Pronouns. A very short excursion here brings us up against another evidence of "the dependence of [NT] language on

---

[1] If it is merely careless Greek, one may compare Par P 60^2 (ii/B.C. ?) *ἀπὸ τῶν πληρωμάτων ἀρχαίων.* (On the whole subject, see further p. 236.)

[2] See note in *CR* xviii. 154*a*.

Semitic speech," in the "extraordinary frequency of the oblique cases of the personal pronouns used without emphasis" (Blass 164). Dependence on Semitic would surely need to be very strongly evidenced in other ways before we could readily accept such an account of elements affecting the whole fabric of everyday speech. Now a redundance of personal pronouns is just what we should expect in the colloquial style, to judge from what we hear in our own vernacular. (Cf Thumb, *Hellen.* 108 f.). A reader of the petitions and private letters in a collection of papyri would not notice any particular difference in this respect from the Greek of the NT. For example, in Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) we see an eminently redundant pronoun in *ἀνύγω* (= *ἀνοίγω*) *τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου.* A specially good case is OP 299 (i/A.D.) *Λάμπωνι μυοθηρευτῇ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ . . . δραχμὰς η*: the syntax is exactly that of Rev 2^{7}, etc. Kälker (*Quæst.* 274) quotes *διὸ καὶ πάλιν ἐπερρώσθησαν διὰ ταῦτα* from Polybius, with other redundances of the kind. Such a line as this from a Klepht ballad (Abbott 42),

καὶ στρίβει τὸ μουστάκι του, κλώθει καὶ τὰ μαλλία του

("and he twirls his moustache and dresses his hair") illustrates the survival of the old vernacular usage in MGr. In words like *κεφαλή*, where the context generally makes the ownership obvious, NT Greek often follows classical Greek and is content with the article. But such a passage as Mt 6^{17}, *ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλήν*, where the middle voice alone would suffice (cf p. 236), shows that the language already is learning to prefer the fuller form. The strength of this tendency enhances the probability that in Jn 8^{38} *τοῦ πατρός* is "the Father" and not "*your* father": see Milligan-Moulton.

Emphasis in Nominative.

It is perhaps rather too readily taken for granted that the personal pronouns must always be emphatic when they appear in the nominative case. H. L. Ebeling (*Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 240) points out that there is no necessary emphasis in the Platonic *ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔφην ἐγώ, ὡς σὺ φῄς*, etc.; and Gildersleeve himself observes (*Synt.* § 69): "The emphasis of the 1st and 2nd persons is not to be insisted on too much in poetry or in familiar prose. Notice the frequency of *ἐγῷδα, ἐγῷμαι*." Are we obliged then to see a special stress in the pronoun whenever it denotes the Master, like the Pythagorean *αὐτὸς ἔφα*? We may perhaps better describe it as fairly represented to the eye by the capital in "He," to the ear by the slower pronunciation which reverence likes to give when the pronoun refers to Christ. Generally the pronoun is unmistakably emphatic in nom., from Mt 1^{21} onwards; but occasionally the force of the emphasis is not obvious—cf Lk 19^{2}. The question suggests itself whether we are compelled to explain the difficult *σὺ εἶπας* and the like (Mt 26^{64} 27^{11}, Mk 15^{2}, Lk 22^{70} 23^{3}, Jn 18^{37}) by putting a stress on the pronoun. Can we drop this and translate, "You have said it," *i.e.* "That is right"? It is pointed out however by Thayer (*JBL* xiii. 40–49) that the *πλήν* in Mt 26^{64} is not satisfied by making the phrase a mere equivalent of "Yes"—to mention only one of the passages where difficulties arise. We seem thrown back on Thayer's rendering "*You* say it," "the word is yours."

Ἡμεῖς for Ἐγώ?

There remains here the difficult question of the use of *ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ*. The grammarian's part in this problem is happily a small one, and need detain us only briefly. K. Dick, in his elaborate study of the question,[1] gives a few apposite examples from late Greek literature and from papyrus letters, which prove beyond all possible doubt that *I* and *we* chased each other throughout these documents without rhyme or reason. We may supplement his exx. with a few more references taken at random. See for example Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.), and AP 130 (i/A.D.—a most illiterate document): add Tb P 26 (ii/B.C.) *ὄντι μοι ἐν Πτολεμαίδει . . . προσέπεσεν ἡμῖν*, *JHS* xix. 92 (ii/A.D.) *χαῖρέ μοι, μῆτερ γλυκυτάτη, καὶ φροντίζετε ἡμῶν ὅσα ἐν νεκροῖς*, and BU 449 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἀκούσας ὅτι νωθρεύῃ ἀγωνιοῦμεν.* For the grammar of the last ex. cf Par P 43 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 54 f.) *ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὐτοί*, EP 13 (222 B.C.) *τί ἂν ποιοῦντες χαριζοίμην*, *al.* Dick succeeds in showing—so Deissmann thinks—that every theory suggested for regularising Paul's use of these pronouns breaks down entirely. It would seem that the question must be passed on from the grammarian to the exegete; for our grammatical material gives us not the slightest evidence of any distinction between the two numbers in ordinary writing. It is futile to argue from Latin to Greek, or we might expect help from Prof. Conway's careful study of *nos* in Cicero's Letters;[1] but the tone of superiority, in various forms, which the *nos* carries, has no parallel in Greek.

---

[1] *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus* (1900), pp. 18 ff. See also Deissmann's summary of this book, *Theol. Rundschau* v. 65.

Reflexive Pronoun.

The reflexive pronouns have developed some unclassical uses, notably that in the plural they are all fused into the forms originally appropriated to the third person. The presence or absence of this confusion in the singular is a nice test of the degree of culture in a writer of Common Greek. In the papyri there are examples of it, mostly in very illiterate documents,[2] while for the plural the use is general, beginning to appear even in classical times.[3] This answers to what we find in the NT, where some seventy cases of the plural occur without a single genuine example of the singular;[4] late scribes, reflecting the developments of their own time, have introduced it into Jn 18^{34} and Rom 13^{9} (Gal 5^{14}). As in the papyri, ἑαυτούς sometimes stands for ἀλλήλους,[a] and sometimes is itself replaced by the personal pronoun. In translations from Semitic originals we may find, instead of ἑαυτόν, a periphrasis with ψυχή;[5] thus Lk 9^{25}, compared with its presumed original Mk 8^{36}. But this principle will have to be most carefully restricted to definitely translated passages; and even there it would be truer to say that ἑαυτόν has been levelled up to τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, than that ψυχή has been emptied of meaning.[6]

"Exhausted" ἑαυτοῦ and ἴδιος.

In one class of phrases ἑαυτοῦ is used without emphasis, in a way that brings up the discussion of its fellow ἴδιος.[b] In sepulchral inscriptions we find a son describing his father as *ὁ πατήρ*, *ὁ ἴδιος πατήρ*, or *ὁ ἑαυτοῦ πατήρ*, and the difference between the three is not very easily discernible. In a number of these inscriptions contained in vol. iii. of the *IMA* I count 21 exx. with *ἴδιος*, 10 with *ἑαυτοῦ*, and 16 with neither. The papyrus formula used in all legal documents where a woman is the principal, viz. *μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτῆς ἀνδρός* (*ἀδελφοῦ*, etc.), gives a parallel for this rather faded use of the reflexive. It starts the more serious question whether *ἴδιος* is to be supposed similarly weakened in Hellenistic. This is often affirmed, and is vouched for by no less an authority than Deissmann (*BS* 123 f.). He calls special attention to such passages in the LXX as Job 24^{12} (*οἴκων ἰδίων*), Prov 27^{15} (*τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου*), 9^{12} (*τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμπελῶνος . . . τοῦ ἰδίου γεωργίου*), 22^{7} (*ἰδίοις δεσπόταις*), in which the pronoun has nothing whatever answering to it in the original. He reminds us that the "exhausted *ἴδιος*" occurs in writers of the literary ***Κοινή***, and that in Josephus even *οἰκεῖος* comes to share this weakening: a few Attic inscriptions from i/B.C. (Meisterhans^{3} 235) show *ἴδιος* with the like attenuated content. Our inference must be that in Ac 24^{24} Luke is not ironically suggesting the poverty of Felix's title, and that in Mt 22^{5} there is no stress on the disloyal guest's busying himself with his own farm instead of someone else's. (Cf p. 237 below.) Perhaps, however, this doctrine of the exhausted *ἴδιος* is in some danger of being worked too hard. In *CR* xv. 440 f. are put down all the occurrences of *ἴδιος* in BU vols. i. and ii., which contain nearly 700 documents of various antiquity. It is certainly remarkable that in all these passages there is not one which goes to swell Deissmann's list. Not even in the Byzantine papyri have we a single case where *ἴδιος* is not exactly represented by the English *own.* In a papyrus as early as the Ptolemaic period we find the possessive pronoun added—*ὄντα ἡμῶν ἴδιον*, which is just like "our own." (Cf 2 Pet 3^{16}, Tit 1^{12}, Ac 2^{8}.) This use became normal in the Byzantine age, in which *ἴδιος* still had force enough to make such phrases as *ἰδίαν καὶ νομίμην γυναῖκα.* Now, in the face of the literary examples, we cannot venture to deny *in toto* the weakening of *ἴδιος*, still less the practical equivalence of *ἴδιος* and *ἑαυτοῦ*, which is evident from the sepulchral inscriptions above cited, as well as from such passages as Prov 9^{12} and 1 Co 7^{2}. But the strong signs of life in the word throughout the papyri have to be allowed for.

---

[1] *Transactions of Cambridge Philological Society*, v. i., 1899.

[2] See *CR* xv. 441, xviii. 154, Mayser 304. It is rather perplexing to find it in literature: *e.g.* Lucian, *Dial. Marin.* iv. 3; Polybius xxxii. 10; Marcus vii. 13; Aristeas 215.

[3] Polybius always uses αὑτῶν (Kälker, *Quaestiones*, p. 277).

[4] In 1 Co 10^{29} ἑαυτοῦ = "one's."

[5] See J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 114.

[6] On the shorter forms αὑτοῦ, etc. see Mayser 305 ff.

[[a] [b] See p. 246

In correlating these perplexing phenomena, we may bring in the following considerations:—(1) The fact that Josephus similarly weakens *οἰκεῖος* seems to show that the question turns on thought rather than on words. (2) It is possible, as our own language shows, for a word to be simultaneously in possession of a full and an attenuated meaning.[1] People who say "It's an awful nuisance," will without any sense of incongruity say "How awful!" when they read of some great catastrophe in the newspaper. No doubt the habitual light use of such words does tend in time to attenuate their content, but even this rule is not universal. "To annoy" is in Hellenistic *σκύλλειν*,[2] and in modern French *gêner*. There was a time when the Greek in thus speaking compared his trouble to the pains of flaying alive, when the Frenchman recalled the thought of *Gehenna*; but the original full sense was unknown to the unlearned speaker of a later day. Sometimes, however, the full sense lives on, and even succeeds in ousting the lighter sense, as in our word *vast*, the adverb of which is now rarely heard as a mere synonym of *very*. (3) The use of the English *own* will help us somewhat. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind" (Rom 14^{5}) has the double advantage of being the English of our daily speech and of representing literally the original *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοΐ.* What function has the adjective there? It is not, as normally, an emphatic assertion of property: I am in no danger of being assured in someone else's mind. It is simply a method of laying stress on the personal pronoun: *ἐν τῷ νοΐ* and "in his mind" alike transfer the stress to the noun.[a] This fact at once shows the equivalence of *ἴδιος* and *ἑαυτοῦ* in certain locutions. Now, when we look at the examples of "exhausted *ἴδιος*," we find that they very largely are attached to words that imply some sort of *belonging*. Husband and wife account for seven examples in the NT, and other relationships, including that of master and slave, for a good many more. A large number come under the category of the mind, thoughts and passions, and parts of the body. House, estate, riding-animal, country or language, and similar very intimate possessions receive the epithet. If occasionally this sense of property is expressed where we should not express it, this need not compromise the assertion that *ἴδιος* itself was always as strong as our English word *own*. There are a host of places in the NT, as in the papyri, where its emphasis is undeniable; *e.g.* Mt 9^{1}, Lk 6^{41}, Jn 1^{41} (note its position) 5^{18} etc., Ac 1^{25}, 1 Co 3^{8}, Gal 6^{5}, Heb 7^{27}, and many others equally decisive. One feels therefore quite justified in adopting the argument of Westcott, Milligan-Moulton, etc., that the emphatic position of *τὸν ἴδιον* in Jn 1^{41} was meant as a hint that the unnamed companion of Andrew, presumably John, fetched *his* brother. What to do in such cases as Ac 24^{24} and Mt 22^{5}, is not easy to say. The Revisers insert *own* in the latter place; and it is fair to argue that the word suggests the strength of the counter-attraction, which is more fully expressed in the companion parable. Lk 14^{18}. The case of Drusilla is less easy. It is hardly enough to plead that *ἴδιος* is customarily attached to the relationship; for (with the Revisers) we instinctively feel that *own* is appropriate in 1 Pet 3^{1} and similar passages, but inappropriate here. It is the only NT passage where there is any real difficulty; and since B stands almost alone in reading *ἰδίᾳ*, the temptation for once to prefer ℵ is very strong. The error may have arisen simply from the commonness of the combination *ἡ ἰδία γυνή*, which was here transferred to a context in which it was not at home.

---

[1] Cf p. 237 below. [2] See *Expos.* VI. iii. 273 f. [[a] See p. 246.

Ὁ ἴδιος.

Before leaving *ἴδιος* something should be said about the use of *ὁ ἴδιος* without a noun expressed. This occurs in Jn 1^{11} 13^{1}, Ac 4^{23} 24^{23} In the papyri we find the singular used thus as a term of endearment to near relations: *e.g.* *ὁ δεῖνα τῷ ἰδίῳ χαίρειν*. In *Expos.* VI. iii. 277 I ventured to cite this as a possible encouragement to those (including B. Weiss) who would translate Ac 20^{28} "the blood of one who was his own." Mt 27^{24}, according to the text of ℵL and the later authorities, will supply a parallel for the grammatical ambiguity: there as here we have to decide whether the second genitive is an adjective qualifying the first or a noun dependent on it. The MGr use of *ὁ ἴδιος*, as substitute for the old *ὁ αὐτός*, has nothing foreshadowing it in the NT; but in the papyrus of Eudoxus (ii/B.C.) we find a passage where *τῆι ἰδίαι* is followed by *τῆι αὐτῆι* in the same sense, so that it seems inevitable to trace, with Blass, an anticipation of MGr here. Perhaps the use was locally restricted.

Αὐτὸς ὁ and ὁ αὐτός.

There is an apparent weakening of *αὐτὸς ὁ* in Hellenistic, which tends to blunt the distinction between this and *ἐκεῖνος ὁ.* Dean Robinson (*Gospels,* p. 106) translates Lk 10^{21} "in that hour" (Mt 11^{25} *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*), and so Lk 12^{12} (Mk 13^{11} *ἐκείνῃ*), and 10^{7}. It is difficult to be satisfied with "John himself" in Mt 3^{4}; and in Luke particularly we feel that the pronoun means little more than "that." Outside Luke, and the one passage of Mt, *αὐτὸς ὁ* has manifestly its full classical force. From the papyri we may quote OP 745 (i/A.D.) *αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀντᾶν*, "the said A.": note also GH 26 (ii/B.C.) *ὁ αὐτὸς Ὧρος*, "the same Horus," *i.e.* "the aforesaid," and so in BU 1052 (i/B.C.). We find the former use in MGr, *e.g.* *αὐτὸ τὸ κρίμα*, "this sin" (Abbott 184), etc. We have already seen (p. 86) that the emphatic *αὐτὸς* standing alone can replace classical *ἐκεῖνος*. (See now Wellh. 26 f.)

Relatives:— Use of ὅστις.

Turning to the Relatives, we note the limiting of *ὅστις*, a conspicuous trait of the vernacular, where the nominative (with the neuter accusative) covers very nearly all the occurrences of the pronoun. The phrase *ἕως ὅτου* is the only exception in NT Greek. The obsolescence of the distinction between *ὅς* and *ὅστις* is asserted by Blass for Luke, but not for Paul. A type like Lk 2^{4} *εἰς πόλιν Δαυεὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ*, may be exactly paralleled from Herodotus (see Blass 173) and from papyri: so in an invitation formula *αὔριον ἥτις ἐστὶν ιε̅*, "to-morrow, which is the 15th"—cf Mt 27^{62}. Hort, on 1 Pet 2^{11} (*Comm.* p. 133), allows that "there are some places in the NT in which *ὅστις* cannot be distinguished from *ὅς*." "In most places, however, of the NT," he proceeds, "*ὅστις* apparently retains its strict classical force, either generic, 'which, as other like things,' or essential, 'which by its very nature.'" A large number of the exceptions, especially in Lucan writings, seem to be by no means cases of *equivalence* between ὅς and ὅστις, whether agreeing or disagreeing with classical use. Some of them would have been expressed with ὅσπερ in Attic: thus in Ac 11[28] we seem to expect ἥπερ ἐγένετο. Others throw a subtle stress on the relative, which can be brought out by various paraphrases, as in Lk 1[20], "which for all that." Or ὅστις represents what in English would be expressed by a demonstrative and a conjunction, as in Lk 10[42], "and it shall not be taken away." In Mt we find ὅστις used four times at the beginning of a parable, where, though the principal figure is formally described as an individual, he is really a *type*, and ὅστις is therefore appropriate. We may refer to Blass 173, for examples of ὅς used for ὅστις, with indefinite reference. The large number of places in which ὅστις is obviously right, according to classical use, may fairly stand as proof that the distinction is not yet dead. We must not stay to trace the distinction further here, but may venture on the assertion that the two relatives are never absolutely convertible, however blurred may be the outlines of the classical distinction in Luke, and possibly in sporadic passages outside his writings. Kälker (*Quæst.* 245 f.) asserts that Polybius uses ὅστις for ὅς before words beginning with a vowel, for no more serious reason than the avoidance of hiatus; and it is curious that among twenty-three more or less unclassical examples in the Lucan books fourteen do happen to achieve this result. We chronicle this fact as in duty bound, but without suggesting any inclination to regard it as a key to our problem. If Kälker is right for Polybius—and there certainly seems weight in his remark that this substitution occurs just where the forms of ὅς end in a vowel—we may have to admit that the distinction during the **Κοινή** period had worn rather thin. It would be like the distinction between our relatives *who* and *that*, which in a considerable proportion of sentences are sufficiently convertible to be selected mostly according to our sense of rhythm or euphony: this, however, does not imply that the distinction is even blurred, much less lost.

The *attraction* of the Relative—which, of course, does

Attraction.

not involve *ὅστις*—is a construction at least as popular in late as in classical Greek. It appears abundantly in the papyri, even in the most illiterate of them; and in legal documents we have the principle stretched further in formulæ, such as *ἀρουρῶν δέκα δύο ἢ ὅσων ἐὰν ὦσιν οὐσῶν.* There are to be noted some exceptions to the general rule of attraction, on which see Blass 173. In several cases of alleged breach of rule we may more probably (with Blass) recognise the implied presence of the "internal accusative": so in 2 Co 1⁴, Eph 1⁶ 4¹, where Dr Plummer (*CGT*, 2 Co *l.c.*) would make the dative the original case for the relative.

Relatives and Interrogatives confused.

Confusion of relative and indirect interrogative is not uncommon. "*Ὅσος, οἷος, ὁποῖος, ἡλίκος* occur in the NT as indirect interrogatives, and also—with the exception of *ἡλίκος*—as relatives," W. F. Moulton observes (WM 210 n.); and in the papyri even *ὅς* can be used in an indirect question. Good examples are found in PP ii. 37 (ii/B.C.) *καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις φροντίσας δι' ὧν δεῖ ταῦτα ἐργασθῆναι*, and RL 29 (iii/B.C.) *φράζοντες [τό τε] αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ ἐν ἧι κώμηι οἰκοῦσιν καὶ π[όσου τιμῶν]ται.* So already in Sophocles, *Antig.* 542, *OT* 1068 (see Jebb's notes); and in Plato, *Euth.* 14E *ἃ μὲν γὰρ διδόασιν, παντὶ δῆλον.* It is superfluous to say that this usage cannot possibly be extended to direct question, so as to justify the AV in Mt 26⁵⁰. The more illiterate papyri and inscriptions show *τίς* for relative *ὅστις* or *ὅς* not seldom, as *εὗρον γεοργὸν τίς αὐτὰ ἑλκύσῃ—τίνος ἐὰν χρίαν ἔχῃς—τίς ἂν κακῶς ποιήσει*,[1] etc. Jebb on Soph. *OT* 1141 remarks that while "*τίς* in classical Greek can replace *ὅστις* only where there is an indirect question, . . . Hellenistic Greek did not always observe this rule: Mk 14³⁶." There is no adequate reason for punctuating Jas 3¹³ so as to bring in this misuse of *τίς*. But Mt 10¹⁹ and Lk 17⁸ are essentially similar;[2] nor does there seem to be any decisive reason against so reading Ac 13²⁵. Dieterich (*Unters.* 200) gives several inscriptional exx., and observes that the use was specially strong in Asia

---

[1] BU 822 (iii/A.D.), BM 239 (iv/A.D.), *JHS* xix. 299. See p. 21 above. Gn 38²⁵ is a clear ex. from LXX.

[2] I must retract the denial I gave in *CR* xv. 441.

Minor. It is interesting therefore to note Thumb's statement (*ThLZ* xxviii. 423), that the interrogative is similarly used in Pontic now—a clear case of local survival. The NT use of ὅτι for τί in a direct question is a curious example of the confusion between the two categories, a confusion much further developed in our own language.

Developments in MGr.

MGr developments are instructive when we are examining the relatives and interrogatives. The normal relative is ποῦ, followed by the proper case of the demonstrative, as ὁ γιατρὸς ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα, "the doctor whom I sent," etc. The ingenious Abbé Viteau discovers a construction very much like this, though he does not draw the parallel, in Jn 9^{17} ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, "thou whose eyes he hath opened": he cites Mk $6^{17f.}$ 8^{24} as further exx. Since ὅ τι and אֲשֶׁר are passable equivalents, we have here a "pure Hebraism"—a gem of the first water! We might better Viteau's instruction by tracing to the same fertile source the MGr idiom, supporting our case with a reference to Jannaris *HG* § 1439, on MGr parallels to Mk 7^{25} (ἧς . . . αὐτῆς) and the like.[1] It will be wise however for us to sober ourselves with a glance at Thumb's remarks, *Hellen.* 130, after which we may proceed to look for parallels nearer home than Hebrew. In older English this was the regular construction. Thus, "thurh God, *the* ic thurh *his* willan hider ásend wæs" (Gen 45^{8}); "namely oon *That* with a spere was thirled *his* brest-boon" (Chaucer, *Knightes Tale* 1851 f.). Cf the German "der du bist" = who art.[2] The idiom is still among us; and Mrs Gamp, remarking "which her name is Mrs Harris," will hardly be suspected of Hebraism! The presence of a usage in MGr affords an almost decisive disproof of Semitism in the *Κοινή*, only one small corner of whose domain came within range of Semitic influences; and we have merely to recognise afresh the ease with which identical idioms may arise in totally independent languages. It does not however follow that Blass is wrong when he claims

---

[1] See below, p. 237; also Wellh. 22, who adds exx. from D.

[2] See Skeat's Chaucer, *Prologue and Knightes Tale*, p. xxxvi. I owe the suggestion to my friend Mr E. E. Kellett.

Mk 7^{25} 1^7 13^{19}, Lk 3^{16}, and passages in Rev, as "specially suggested by Semitic usage." The phenomenon is frequent in the LXX (see WM 185), and the NT exx. are nearly all from places where Aramaic sources are presumed. A vernacular use may be stretched (cf pp. 10 f.) beyond its natural limits, when convenient for literal translation. But Blass's own quotation, *οὗ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν,*[1] comes from a piece of free Greek. That this use did exist in the old vernacular, away from any Semitic influence, is proved by the papyri (p. 85). The quotations in Kühner-Gerth § 561 n.^{2}, and in Blass and Winer *ll.cc.*, show that it had its roots in the classical language. As was natural in a usage which started from anacoluthon, the relative and the pleonastic demonstrative were generally, in the earlier examples, separated by a good many intervening words.

The modern Interrogative is mostly *ποιός*, for *τίς* has practically worn down to the indeclinable *τί*, just as our *what* (historically identical with the Latin *quod*) has become indifferent in gender. The NT decidedly shows the early stages of this extension of *ποῖος*. It will not do for us to refine too much on the distinction between the two pronouns. The weakening of the special sense of *ποῖος* called into being a new pronoun to express the sense *qualis*, namely, *ποταπός*, which was the old *ποδαπός* ("of what country ?"), modified by popular etymology to suggest *πότε*, and thus denuded of its association in meaning with *ἀλλοδ-απός*, *ἡμεδ-απός*, and *ὑμεδ-απός*.[2]

Numerals :— εἷς as ordinal ;

We take next the Numerals. The use of *εἷς* as an ordinal is "undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom," according to Blass, p. 144. Our doubts, nevertheless, will not be repressed; and they are encouraged by the query in Thumb's review. To begin with, why did the Hebraism affect only the first numeral, and not its successors ? If the use was vernacular Greek, the reason of the restriction is obvious: *πρῶτος* is the only ordinal which altogether differs in form from the cardinal.[1] When we add that both German and English say "*page forty*" (WM 311), we are prepared for the belief that the Greek vernacular also had this natural use. Now, although *εἷς καὶ εἰκοστός, unus et vicesimus, one and twentieth,* are (as Blass says) essentially different, since the ordinal element is present at the end of the phrase, this is not so with *τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι,*[2] BU 623 (ii/iii A.D.). But the matter is really settled by the fact that in MGr the cardinals beyond 4 have ousted the ordinals entirely (Thumb, *Handbuch* 56); and Dieterich (*Unters.* 187 f.) shows from inscriptions that the use is as old as Byzantine Greek. It would seem then that the encroachment of the cardinal began in the one case where the ordinal was entirely distinct in form, spread thence over other numerals, and was finally repelled from the first four, in which constant use preserved alike the declension and the distinct ordinal form. Had Semitic influence been at work, there is no conceivable reason why we should not have had *τῇ πέντε* at the same time. Simultaneously with this process we note the firm establishment of simplified ordinals from 13th to 19th, which now (from iii/B.C onwards) are exclusively of the form *τρισκαιδέκατος, τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος*, etc., with only isolated exceptions. Similarly we find *δέκα τρεῖς, δέκα ἕξ*, etc., almost invariably in papyri, and *δέκα δύο* as well as *δώδεκα.*[3a] These phenomena all started in the classical period: cf Meisterhans³ 160.

---

[1] Clement *ad Cor.* 21 *fin.* (Lightfoot, p. 78). Nestle (*ZNTW* i. 178 ff.) thinks the writer was of Semitic birth. Gal 2^{10} will serve instead.

[2] The suffix is that of Latin *prop-inquos*, *long-inquos*, Skt. *anv-añc*, etc. : *ποδ-* and *ἀλλοδ-* are *quod*, *what*, *aliud*, while *ἡμεδ-*, *ὑμεδ-*, answer to ablative forms in Skt.

Simplification of the "teens";

εἷς as Indefinite Article.

There is a further use of *εἷς* which calls for remark, its development into an indefinite article, like *ein* in German, *un* in French, or our own *an*: in MGr the process is complete. The fact that εἷς progressively ousted τις in popular speech, and that even in classical Greek there was a use which only needed a little diluting to make it essentially the same,[1] is surely enough to prove that the development lay entirely within the Greek language, and only by accident agrees with Semitic. (See Wellh. 27.) We must not therefore follow Meyer (on Mt 8^{19}), in denying that εἷς is ever used in the NT in the sense of τις: it is dangerous to import exegetical subtleties into the **ὁ εἷς.** NT, against the known history of the Common Greek. The use of ὁ εἷς in Mk 14^{10} is, as noted in *Expos.* VI. vii. 111, paralleled in early papyri.[2]

---

[1] Δεύτερος is not derived from δύο, but popular etymology would naturally connect them. Curiously enough, Hebrew shares the peculiarity noted above, which somewhat weakens our argument: Aramaic, like Latin and English, uses a word distinct from the cardinal for *second* as well as *first.* Hebrew has lost all ordinals beyond 10, and Aramaic shows them only in the *Jerus. Targ.* See Dalman, *Gramm.* 99 f. For days of the month, the encroachment of cardinals has gone further still in both dialects. The fact that the ordinals up to 10 are all treated alike in Hebrew, reinforces our view.

[2] Εἰκάς, like τριάς, δεκάς, τριακάς, etc., was originally either *No. 20* or *a set of 20*, though used only for the 20th of the month. Cf in Philo τριάς = *3rd day* (LS), and τετράς, the usual name for Wednesday, surviving in MGr: see p. 237.

[3] Wellhausen notes that D has only δέκα δύο and ιβ̄. [a See p. 246.

In Blass's second edition (p. 330) we find a virtual surrender **Distributives.** of the Hebraism in δύο δύο, συμπόσια συμπόσια (Mk $6^{39f.}$), δεσμὰς δεσμάς (Mt 13^{30} in Epiphanius—a very probable reading, as accounting for the variants): he remarks on μίαν μίαν in Sophocles (Frag. 201) that "Atticists had evidently complained of it as vulgar, and it was not only Jewish-Greek." Winer compared Aeschylus *Persæ* 981, μυρία μυρία πεμπαστάν. Deissmann (*ThLZ*, 1898, p. 631) cites δήσῃ τρία τρία from OP 121 (iii/A.D.); and (as W. F. Moulton noted WM 312 n.) the usage is found in MGr.[3] Thumb is undeniably right in calling the coincidence with Hebrew a mere accident. In the papyri (*e.g.* Tb P 63^5—ii/B.C.) the repetition of an *adjective* produces an elative = μεγάλου μεγάλου = μεγίστου. It should be added that in Lk 10^1 we have a mixed distributive ἀνὰ δύο δύο (B *al*): so in *Ev. Petr.* 35, as Blass notes, and *Acta Philippi* 92 (Tisch.).[4] See Brugmann, *Distributiva* (cited above, p. 21).

"Noah the eighth person." Two single passages claim a word before we pass on from the numerals. Ὄγδοον Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν in 2 Pet 2^5 presents us with a classical idiom which can be shown to survive at any rate in literary Common Greek: see exx. in WM 312, and Schaefer *l.c.* I have only noticed one instance in the papyri (p. 107), and in 2 Pet we rather expect bookish phrases. The AV of this passage is an instructive illustration for our inquiries as to Hebraisms. "Noah the eighth person" is not English, for all its appearing in a work which we are taught to regard as the impeccable standard of classic purity. It is a piece of "translation English," and tolerably unintelligible too, one may well suppose, to its less educated readers. Now, if this specimen of translators' "nodding" had made its way into the language—like the misprint "strain *at* a gnat"—we should have had a fair parallel for "Hebraism" as hitherto understood. As it stands, a phrase which no one has ever thought of imitating, it serves to illustrate the over-literal translations which appear very frequently in the LXX and in the NT, where a Semitic original underlies the Greek text. (Compare what is said of Gallicisms in English on p. 13.)

---

[1] It is difficult to see any difference between εἷς and τις in Aristophanes, *Av.* 1292:—

πέρδιξ μὲν εἷς κάπηλος ὠνομάζετο
χωλός, Μενίππῳ δ' ἦν χελιδὼν τοὔνομα, κ.τ.λ.

From the papyri we may cite as exx. AP 30 (ii/B.C.) Κονδύλου ἑνὸς τῶν ἁλιείων (sc. προσκληθέντος); BU 1044 (iv/A.D.) ἕνος (*sic* = εἷς) λεγόμενον (= -ος) Φαῆσις.

[2] We may add good exx. from Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) τὸν ἕνα αὐτῶν Ὧρον—τοῦ ἑνὸς τῶν ἐγκαλουμένων Νεχουθοῦ. Tb P 357 (ii/A.D.) τοῦ τοῦ ἑνὸς αὐτῶν πατρός.

[3] Thumb, *Hellen.* 128, *Handbuch* 57.

[4] See W. Schulze, *Graeca Latina* 13. Add now Wellh. 31.

"Seventy times seven."

Last in this division comes a note on Mt 18[22]. Blass ignores entirely the rendering "seventy-seven times" (RVmargin), despite the fact that this meaning is unmistakable in Gen 4[24] (LXX). It will surely be felt that W. F. Moulton (WM 314) was right in regarding that passage as decisive. A definite *allusion* to the Genesis story is highly probable: Jesus pointedly sets against the natural man's craving for seventy-sevenfold revenge the spiritual man's ambition to exercise the privilege of seventy-sevenfold forgiveness. For a partial grammatical parallel see *Iliad* xxii. 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ Ϝείκοσι, "tenfold and twenty-fold," if the text is sound.

Prepositions:— Relative Frequency.

It will be worth while to give statistics for the relative frequency of Prepositions in the NT, answering to those cited from Helbing (above, pp. 62 f.) for the classical and post-classical historians. If we represent ἐν by unity, the order of precedence works out thus:—εἰς ·64, ἐκ ·34, ἐπί ·32, πρός ·25, διά ·24, ἀπό ·24, κατά ·17, μετά ·17, περί ·12, ὑπό ·08, παρά ·07, ὑπέρ ·054, σύν ·048, πρό ·018, ἀντί ·008, ἀνά ·0045. We shall have to return later to prepositions compounded with verbs, following our present principle of

Prepositions joined with Adverbs.

dealing with them in connexion with the parts of speech with which they are used. A few miscellaneous matters come in best at this point. First let us notice the prominence in Hellenistic of combinations of prepositions with adverbs. In papyri we find such as *ἐκ τότε*, OP 486 (ii/A.D.), *ἀπὸ πέρυσι* (Deissmann *BS* 221), and even *ἀφ' ὅτε ἐλουσάμην*, "since I last bathed," OP 528 (ii/A.D.). In NT we have *ἀπὸ τότε, ἀπὸ πέρυσι, ἀπ' ἄρτι, ἐκ πάλαι, ἐφ' ἅπαξ, ἐπὶ τρίς*, etc. The roots of the usage may be seen in the classical *ἐς ἀεί* and the like. Some of these combinations became fixed, as *ὑποκάτω, ὑπεράνω, κατέναντι*. This may be set beside the abundance of "Improper" prepositions. All of these, except *ἐγγύς* and *ἅμα*, take gen. only.[1] Thumb comments[2] on the survival of such as *ἕως, ἐπάνω, ὀπίσω, ὑποκάτω*, in MGr. Hebraism in this field was supposed to have been responsible for the coining of *ἐνώπιον*, till Deissmann proved it vernacular.[3] The compound preposition *ἀνὰ μέσον* was similarly aspersed; but it has turned up abundantly in the papyri,—not however in any use which would help 1 Co 6^5, where it is almost impossible to believe the text sound. (An exact parallel occurs in the *Athenæum* for Jan. 14, 1905, where a writer is properly censured for saying, "I have attempted to discriminate between those which are well authenticated," *i.e.* (presumably) "[and those which are not]." It is hard to believe Paul would have been so slovenly in writing, or even dictating.) We have a further set of "Hebraisms" in the compound prepositions which are freely made with *πρόσωπον, χείρ* and *στόμα* (Blass 129 f.): see above, p. 81. Even here the Semitism is still on the familiar lines: a phrase which is possible in native Greek is extended widely beyond its idiomatic limits because it translates exactly a common Hebrew locution; and the conscious use of Biblical turns of speech explains the application of such phrases on the lips of men whose minds are saturated with the sacred writers' language. As early as iii/B.C., in a Libyan's will, we meet with *κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος*;[1] and in mercantile language we constantly find the formula *διὰ χειρός*, used absolutely, it is true—*e.g.* MP 25 (iii/B.C.), "from hand to hand," as contrasted with "through an intermediary." We may refer to Heitmüller's proof[2] that the kindred phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος* is good vernacular. The strong tendency to use compound prepositional phrases, which we have been illustrating already, would make it all the easier to develop these adaptations of familiar language.

---

[1] Παραπλήσιον Phil 2^{27} ℵACD has dat. [2] *ThLZ* xxviii. 422. [3] *BS* 213. Cf *Expos.* VI. vii. 113: add OP 658 (iii/A.D.), and Tb P 14 (114 B.C.) παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον, "I gave notice in person." Hb P 30 (before 271 B.C.) is the earliest ex. Cf Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) ἐνοπίοις (so Mahaffy); and see Mayser 457.

Prepositions with one case.

The eighteen classical prepositions are, as we have just seen, all represented in NT Greek, except *ἀμφί*, which has disappeared as a separate word, like *ambi* in Latin, and like its correlative in English, the former existence of which in our own branch is shown by the survival of *um* in modern German. It was not sufficiently differentiated from *περί* to assert itself in the competition; and the decay of the idea of duality weakened further a preposition which still proclaimed its original meaning, "on both sides," by its resemblance to *ἀμφότεροι*. *Ἀνά* has escaped the same fate by its distributive use, which accounts for seven instances, the phrase *ἀνὰ μέσον* for four, and *ἀνὰ μέρος* for one. *Ἀντί* occurs 22 times, but *ἀνθ' ὧν* reduces the number of free occurrences to 17. Rare though it is, it retains its individuality. "In front of," with a normal adnominal genitive, passes naturally into "in place of," with the idea of equivalence or return or substitution, our *for*. For the preposition in Jn 1^{16}, an excellent parallel from Philo is given in WM (p. 456 n.).[3] *Πρό* occurs 48 times, including 9 exx. of *πρὸ τοῦ* c. inf., which invades the province of *πρίν*. In Jn 12^{1} we have *πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα*, which looks extremely like *ante diem tertium Kalendas*. The plausible Latinism forces itself on our attention all the more when we compare *IMA* iii. 325 (ii/A.D.)

---

[1] Deissmann *BS* 140.

[2] *Im Namen Jesu* 100 ff. So p. 63, for *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι*, Mk 9^{41}.

[3] Blass compares *γῆν πρὸ γῆς ἐλαύνεσθαι*, "from one land to another," *ἐλπίσιν ἐξ ἐλπίδων*, and the like (p. 124). The Philonic passage is from *De Poster. Caini* § 145 (p. 254 M.): *διὸ τὰς πρώτας αἰεὶ χάριτας, πρὶν κορεσθέντας ἐξυβρίσαι τοὺς λαχόντας, ἐπισχὼν καὶ ταμιευσάμενος εἰσαῦθις ἑτέρας ἀντ' ἐκείνων, καὶ τρίτας ἀντὶ τῶν δευτέρων καὶ αἰεὶ νέας ἀντὶ παλαιοτέρων . . . ἐπιδίδωσι.*

πρὸ ιε̄ Καλανδῶν Αὐγούστων, and parallels in translated documents to be seen in Viereck's *Sermo Græcus* (see pp. 12, 13, 21, etc.). And yet it is soon found that the same construction occurs in phrases which have nothing in common with the peculiar formula of Latin days of the month. In the Mysteries inscription from Andania (Michel 694, i/B.C.) we recognise it in Doric—*πρὸ ἁμερᾶν δέκα τῶν μυστηρίων*; and the illiterate vernacular of FP 118 (ii/A.D.), *πρῶ δύο ἡμερο̂ν ἀγόρασον τὰ ὀρνιθάρια τῆς εἱορτῆς* ("buy the fowls two days before the feast"), when combined with Jn *l.c.*, makes the hypothesis of Latinism utterly improbable. The second genitive in these three passages is best taken as an ablative—"*starting from* the mysteries," etc. It is found as early as Herodotus, who has (vi. 46) *δευτέρῳ ἔτει τούτων*, "in the second year *from* these events": cf also OP 492 (ii/A.D.) *μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα τῆς τελευτῆς μου*, "a year after (starting from) my death." See also the note on *ὀψέ*, *supr.* p. 72. There remains the idiomatic use of *πρό*, seen in 2 Co 12^2 *πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων*, "fourteen years before." Blass (p. 127 n.) cites *πρὸ ἁμερᾶν δέκα* from the will of Epicteta (Michel 1001), written in the Doric of Thera, "end of iii/B.C. or beginning of ii/B.C., therefore pre-Roman"—to cite Blass's own testimony.[1] It becomes clear that historically the resemblance between the *ante diem* idiom and the Greek which translates it is sheer coincidence, and the supposed Latinism goes into the same class as the Hebraisms we have so often disposed of already.[2] This enquiry, with the general considerations as to Latinisms which were advanced above (pp. 20 f.), will serve to encourage scepticism when we note the resemblance of ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε (Jn 11^{18}) to *a millibus passuum duobus* (Blass 95). Blass cites Jn 21^{8}, Rev 14^{20}, and the usage of *Κοινή* writers like Diodorus and Plutarch. *Mutatis mutandis*, this idiom is identical in principle with that just quoted for πρό. After noting the translation-Hebraism φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό in Mt 10^{28} (= Lk 12^{4}),[1] we proceed to observe the enlargement of the sphere of ἀπό, which encroaches upon ἐκ, ὑπό, and παρά.[a] The title of the modern vernacular Gospels, "μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη," reminds us that ἀπό has advanced further in the interval. Already in the NT it sometimes expressed the agent after passive verbs (*e.g.* Lk 8^{43}), where it is quite unnecessary to resort to refinements unless the usage of a particular writer demands them. The alleged Hebraism in καθαρὸς ἀπό is dispelled by Deissmann's quotations, *BS* 196. The use of prepositions, where earlier Greek would have been content with a simple case, enables ἐκ in NT to outnumber ἀπό still, though obsolete to-day,[b] except in the Epirot ἀχ or ὀχ.[2] Thus ἀπό is used to express the partitive sense, and to replace the genitive of material (as Mt 27^{21} 3^{4}); ἐκ can even make a partitive phrase capable of becoming subject of a sentence, as in Jn 16^{17}. For present purposes we need not pursue further the NT uses of ἀπό and ἐκ, which may be sought in the lexicon; but we may quote two illustrative inscriptional passages with ἐκ. Letronne 190 and 198 have σωθεὶς ἐκ, "safe home from" (a place), which has affinity with Heb 5^{7}; and ὑπάρχων θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς, from the Rosetta stone (*OGIS* 90—ii/B.C.), will elucidate Phil 3^{5}, if the reader of the Greek should, conceivably, fall into the misconceptions which so many English readers entertain. It gives us an unpleasant start to find the language of the Nicene Creed used centuries earlier of Ptolemy Epiphanes![3]

---

[1] Add FP 122 (i/ii A.D.), BU 180 (ii/iii A.D.), 592 (ii/A.D.), NP 47 (iii/A.D.), Ch P 15 (iv/A.D.), BU 836 (vi/A.D).

[2] W. Schulze, *Graec. Lat.* 14–19, has a long and striking list of passages illustrating the usage in question, which shows how common it became. His earliest citation is πρὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς τελευτῆς from Hippocrates (v/B.C.), which will go with that from Herodotus given above. We have accordingly both Ionic and Doric warrant for this Κοινή construction, dating from a period which makes Latin necessarily the borrower, were we bound to deny independent development. Schulze adds a parallel from Lithuanian! Our explanation of the dependent gen. as an ablative is supported by *πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἢ c. acc. et inf.*, in *OGIS* 435 (ii/B.C.) and Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 317: *ἤ* replaces the ablative genitive exactly as it does after comparatives.

We have already (pp. 62 f.) sketched the developments of

---

[1] Were the active φοβεῖν still extant (below, p. 162), this might be taken as "do not be panic-stricken by." It is like προσέχειν ἀπό, Lk 12^{1}. See p. 107.

[2] Thus ὀχ τὸ βουνό, "from the hill," occurs in a modern song, Abbott 128 f.

[3] Epiphanes = Avatar: the common translation "illustrious" is no longer tenable. See Dittenberger's note, *OGIS* i. p. 144. So this title also anticipates the NT (ἐπιφάνεια). Cf what is said on Christian adaptations of heathen terms, above, p. 84. (On ἀπό see also below, p. 237.) [[a] [b] See p. 246

Further uses of ἐν.

εἰς, and need say no more of the single-case prepositions, with one very large exception.[a] The late Greek uses of ἐν would take too much space if discussed in full here. It has become so much a maid-of-all-work that we cannot wonder at its ultimate disappearance, as too indeterminate. Students of Pauline theology will not need to be reminded of Deissmann's masterly monograph on "*The NT Formula* ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ," with its careful investigation of LXX uses of ἐν, and proof of the originality of Paul's use. But SH (on Rom 6^{11}) seem rightly to urge that the idea of the mystic indwelling originated with the Master's own teaching: the actual phrase in Jn 15^{4} may be determined by Pauline language, but in the original Aramaic teaching the thought may have been essentially present. While there are a good many NT uses of ἐν which may be paralleled in vernacular documents, there are others beside this one which cannot: in their case, however, analogy makes it highly improbable that the NT writers were innovating. If papyri have προβεβηκότες ἤδη τοῖς ἔτεσιν (TP 1—ii/B.C.), we need not assume Hebraism in Lk 1^{7} merely because the evangelist inserts ἐν: his faithful preservation of his source's ἡμέραις is another matter. See pp. 61 f. above. In Ac 7^{14} (LXX) we have ἐν = "amounting to," from which that in Mk 4^{8} *bis* does not greatly differ. This is precisely paralleled by BU 970 (ii/A.D.) προοῖκα ἐν δραχμαῖς ἐννακοσίαις, OP 724 (ii/A.D.) ἔσχες τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, BU 1050 (i/A.D.) ἱμάτια . . . ἐν . . . δραχμαῖς ἑκατόν ("to the value of"). The use in Eph 2^{15} ἐν δόγμασιν, "consisting in," is akin to this. For ἐν τοῖς = "in the house of," as in Lk 2^{49}, we have RL 38^{2} (iii/B.C.) ἐν τοῖς Ἀπολλωνίου, Tb P 12 (ii/B.C.) ἐν τοῖς Ἀμεννέως "in A.'s office," OP 523 (ii/A.D.) ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδίου: cf Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) εἰς τὰ Πρωτάρχου καταλύσω, and even ἐν τῶι Ὥρου in Tb P 27. We have in official documents ἐν meaning "in the department of": so Tb P 27 (ii/B.C.) τὸ ἐν αὐτῶι ὀφειλόμενον, 72 ἃς ἐν Μαρρεῖ τοπογραμματεῖ, *al.* I do not recall an exact NT parallel, but 1 Co 6^{2}, εἰ ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος, is not far away. We have another use of ἐν with a personal dative in 1 Co 14^{11} "in my judgement": possibly Jude^{1} ἐν Θεῷ is akin to this. Such uses would answer to παρά c. dat. in classical Greek

---

[a] See p. 246.

The last might seem to be expressed more naturally by the "dative of person judging" (like Ac 7^{20} ἀστεῖος τῷ Θεῷ, or 1 Co *l.c.* ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος). But the earliest uses of dative and locative have some common ground, which is indeed the leading cause of their syncretism. Thus we find loc. in Sanskrit used quite often for the dat. of indirect object after verbs of speaking. How readily ἐν was added to the dative, which in older Greek would have needed no preposition, we see well in such a passage as OP 488 (ii/iii A.D.), where "more . . . *by* one *aroura*" is expressed by ἐν. This particular dative is an instrumental—the same case as our "*the* more *the* merrier"—, and is therefore parallel to that of ἐν μαχαίρῃ, "armed *with* a sword," which we have already mentioned (pp. 12, 61). We may fairly claim that "Hebraistic" ἐν is by this time reduced within tolerably narrow limits. One further ἐν may be noted for its difficulty, and for its bearing on Synoptic questions,—the ὁμολογεῖν ἔν τινι which is common to Mt 10^{32} and Lk 12^{8}: this is among the clearest evidences of essentially identical translations used in Mt and Lk. W. F. Moulton (WM 283 n.) cites, apparently with approval, Godet's explanation—"the repose of faith *in* Him whom it confesses": so Westcott, quoting Heracleon, who originated this view (*Canon*^{5} 305 n.). Deissmann (*In Christo* 60) quotes Delitzsch's Hebrew rendering יוֹדֶה בִּי, and puts it with Mt 3^{17} 9^{34} 11^{6} 23^{21}, as an example of a literal translation "mit ängstlicher, die hermeneutische Pedanterie nahelegender Pietät." Dr Rendel Harris recalls the Græcised translation in Rev 3^{5}, and gives me Syriac parallels. On the whole, it seems best not to look for justification of this usage in Greek. The agreement of Mt and Lk, in a point where accidental coincidence is out of the question, remains the most important element in the whole matter, proving as it does that Luke did not use any knowledge of Aramaic so as to deal independently with the translated Logia that came to him.[1]

Prepositions with two Cases;

Of the prepositions with two cases, διά and μετά show no signs of weakening their hold on both; but κατά c. gen. and περί ὑπέρ and ὑπό c. acc. distinctly fall behind

---

[1] Cf the similar agreement as to φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό, above, p. 102.

We may give the statistics in proof. *Διά* gen. 382, acc 279; *μετά* gen. 361, acc. 100; *κατά* gen. 73, acc. 391, *περί* gen. 291, acc. 38; *ὑπέρ* gen. 126, acc. 19; *ὑπό* gen. 165, acc. 50. Comparing this list with that in a classical Greek grammar, we see that *μετά*, *περί* and *ὑπό*[1] have been detached from connexion with the dative—a fact in line with those noted above, pp. 62 ff. Turning to details, we find that *κατά* (like *ἀνά*, Rev 21^{21}) is used as an adverb distributively, as in *τὸ καθ' εἷς* or *εἷς κατὰ εἷς* Mk 14^{19}, [Jn] 8^{9}, Rom 12^{5}. The MGr *καθείς* or *καθένας*, "each," preserves this, which probably started from the stereotyping of *τὸ καθ' ἕνα*, *ἓν καθ' ἕν*, etc., declined by analogy: cf *ἔνδημος* from *ἐν δήμῳ* (*ὤν*), or *proconsul* from *pro consule.* The enfeebling of the distinction between *περί* and *ὑπέρ* c. gen. is a matter of some importance in the NT, where these prepositions are used in well-known passages to describe the relation of the Redeemer to man or man's sins. It is an evident fact that *ὑπέρ* is often a colourless "about," as in 2 Co 8^{23}: it is used, for example, scores of times in accounts, with the sense of our commercial "to." This seems to show that its original fullness of content must not be presumed upon in theological definitions, although it may not have been wholly forgotten. The distinction between *ἀντί* and the more colourless *ὑπέρ*, in applying the metaphor of purchase, is well seen in Mk 10^{45} (= Mt 20^{28}) λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, and the quotation of this logion in 1 Tim 2^{6} *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.*[2] *Διά* c. acc. mostly retains its meaning "for the sake of," "because of," distinct from "through," "by the instrumentality of,' which belongs to the genitive. As early as MP 16 and 20 (iii/B.C.), we have *ἵνα διὰ σὲ βασιλεῦ τοῦ δικαίου τύχω*; but if the humble petitioner had meant "*through* you," he would have addressed the king as a mere medium of favour: referring to a sovereign power, the ordinary meaning "because of you" is more appropriate. This applies exactly to Jn 6^{57}. So Rom 8^{20}, where Winer's explanation is correct (p. 498). In much later Greek, as Hatzidakis shows (p. 213)

---

[1] For *ὑπό* c. dat. can be quoted *OGIS* 54 (iii/B.C.) *ὑφ' ἑαυτῶι ποιησάμενος*, and OP 708 (as late as ii/A.D.) *ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ σοὶ νομοῦ.* LXX has *περί* c. dat.

[2] Note that *δοὺς ἑαυτόν* is substituted for the translation-Greek *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*: on this see above, p. 87. See further on *ὑπέρ*, p. 237.

διά c. acc. monopolised the field, which it still holds in MGr.[1] With the genitive, *διά* is often contrasted with *ἐκ*, *ὑπό*, etc., as denoting mediate and not original authorship: as 1 Co 8^{6}, Mt 1^{22}. In Heb 2^{10} it is used of God, who is "the final Cause and the efficient Cause of all things" (Westcott). There seems no adequate reason for accepting Blass's conjectural emendation, *δι' ἀσθενείας*, in Gal 4^{13}: "*because of* an illness" is an entirely satisfactory statement (see Lightfoot *in loc.*), and the Vulgate *per* is not strong enough to justify Blass's confidence.[2] *Μετά* c. gen. has in Lk 1^{58} a use influenced by literal translation from Semitic.[a] Its relations with *σύν* are not what they were in Attic, but it remains very much the commoner way of saying *with*. Thumb points out (*Hellen.* 125) that MGr use disproves Hebraism in *πολεμεῖν μετά τινος*, Rev 12^{7} *al.*[b] Thus, for example, Abbott 44: *πολέμησε μὲ τρεῖς χιλιάδες Τούρκους*, "he fought with 3000 Turks."

and with three.

The category of prepositions used with three cases is hurrying towards extinction, as we should expect. *Μετά*, *περί* and *ὑπό* have crossed the line into the two-case class; and in the NT *πρός* has nearly gone a step further, for its figures are c. gen. 1 (Ac 27^{34}, literary), dat. 6 (= "close to" or "at," in Mk, Lk, Jn *ter* and Rev), acc. 679. With the dative, however, it occurs 104 times in LXX, and 23 times c. gen.: the decay seems to have been rapid. Cf however PFi 5 *πρὸς τῷ πυλῶνι*, as late as 245 A.D. For *παρά* the numbers are, c. gen. 78, dat. 50, acc. 60. Blass notes that c. dat. it is only used of persons, as generally in classical Greek, except in Jn 19^{25}. One phrase with *παρά* calls for a note on its use in the papyri. *Οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* is exceedingly common there to denote "his agents" or "representatives." It has hitherto been less easy to find parallels for Mk 3^{21}, where it must mean "his family": see Swete and Field *in loc.* We can now cite GH 36 (ii/B.C.) *οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες*,

---

[1] Contrast Ac 24^{2} with OP 41 (iii/iv A.D.) *πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύομεν διὰ σαί.*

[2] *Οὐ δυνάμενος δι' ἀσθένειαν πλεῦσαι* may be quoted from OP 726 (ii/A.D.), and a like phrase from OP 261 (i/A.D.), but of course they prove little or nothing.

[[a] See pp. 246 f.; [b] see p. 247.

BU 998 (ii/B.C.), and Par P 36 (ii/B.C.).[1] Finally we come to *ἐπί*, the only preposition which is still thoroughly at home with all the cases (gen. 216, dat. 176, acc. 464). The weakening of case-distinctions is shown however by the very disproportion of these figures, and by the confusion of meaning which is frequently arising. In Heb 8^{10} 10^{16} we construe *καρδίας* as acc. only because of *ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν* which follows it in the latter passage: on the other hand, the original in Jer $31(38)^{33}$ is singular, which favours taking it as genitive.[2] Our local *upon* can in fact be rendered by *ἐπί* with gen., dat., or acc., with comparatively little difference of force. Particular phrases are appropriated to the several cases, but the reason is not always obvious, though it may often be traced back to classical language, where distinctions were rather clearer. Among the current phrases we may note *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* "together," "in all," perpetually used in arithmetical statements: see Ac 1^{15} 2^{47}. Cf Blass^2 330. The common *ἐφ' ᾧ* c. fut. indic. "on condition that," does not appear in the NT. But with a pres. in 2 Co 5^4, and an aor. in Rom 5^{12}, the meaning is essentially the same ("in view of the fact that'), allowing for the sense resulting from a jussive future.

---

[1] *Expos.* VI. vii. 118, viii. 436. See Witkowski's note, p. 72.

[2] For Mk 6^{39} *ἐπὶ τῷ χόρτῳ*, Mt 14^{19} substitutes *ἐπὶ τοῦ χ.*, but with *ἐπὶ τὸν χ.* in D. In Ac 7^{11} D has gen. for acc., and in 8^{16} acc. for dat. In Eph 1^{10} it seems difficult to draw any valid distinction between the cases of *ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* and *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Nor can we distinguish between *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* in Heb 1^1 and the dative in Tb P 69 (ii/B.C.), *ὧν ἡ διοίκησις ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τέτακται*.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—P. 79. Mr Thackeray says *πρῶτος* is used for *πρότερος* regularly in LXX. The latter occurs not infrequently in Ptolemaic papyri, but seems to have weakened greatly in the Roman period.—P. 98. The Ptolemaic PP iii. 28 has *ἐδραγματοκλέπτει τρίτος ὤν*. Cf Abbott *JG* 562 on *μόνος· αὐτός* Jn 6^{15}ℵ. On Mt 18^{22}, W. C. Allen takes 70×7 in Gen and Mt *ll.cc.* alike. A further parallel for cardinal in place of adverb is BU 1074 (late iii/A.D.) *τρισπυθιονείκης*, but *δεκαολυμπιονείκης*, etc.—P. 99. In *Syll.* 385^9 Hadrian says he could not find *ἐκ πότε φέρειν αὐτὸ ἤρξασθε*. This is a fairly close parallel to the *ἕως πότε* which Dr Nestle brings up against my argument about Semitisms. If it "may be quotable from early Greek," I cannot quite see why it is for Dr Nestle "a Hebraism, even if it is still used by Pallis in his MGr translation." I seem to hear the shade of Hadrian demanding "Am I a Jew?"—P. 102. BU 1079 (41 A.D.) *βλέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, "take heed to yourself against the Jews (*i.e.* moneylenders)," contains an idiom which the Hebraists will hardly care to claim now!—P. 103. Fresh exx. of *ἐν* accumulate in a great variety of meanings. Amongst them I have only room for the Delphian inscr., *Syll.* 850^8 (iii/B.C.) *κριθέντω ἐν ἄνδροις τρίοις*, "let them be tried before three judges," a good illustration of *ἐν* in Ac 17^{31}.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VERB: TENSES AND MODES OF ACTION.

"Aktionsart."

OUR first subject under the Verb will be one which has not yet achieved an entrance into the grammars. For the last few years the comparative philologists—mostly in Germany—have been busily investigating the problems of *Aktionsart*, or the "kind of action" denoted by different verbal formations. The subject, complex in itself, has unfortunately been entangled not a little by inconsistent terminology; but it must be studied by all who wish to understand the rationale of the use of the Tenses, and the extremely important part which Compound Verbs play in the Greek and other Indo-Germanic languages. The English student may be referred to pp. 477 ff. of Dr P. Giles's admirable *Manual of Comparative Philology*, ed. 2. A fuller summary may be found in pp. 471 ff. of Karl Brugmann's *Griech. Gramm.*, ed. 3, where the great philologist sets forth the results of Delbrück and other pioneers in comparative syntax, with an authority and lucidity all his own.

Conjugation and Tense Stems.

The student of Hebrew will not need telling that a Tense-system, dividing verbal action into the familiar categories of Past, Present and Future, is by no means so necessary to language as we once conceived it to be. It may be more of a surprise to be told that in our own family of languages Tense is proved by scientific inquiry to be relatively a late invention, so much so that the elementary distinction between Past and Present had only been developed to a rudimentary extent when the various branches of the family separated so that they ceased to be mutually intelligible. As the language then possessed no Passive whatever, and no distinct Future, it will be realised that its resources needed not a little supplementing. But if they were scanty in one direction, they were superabundant in another. Brugmann distinguishes no less than twenty-three conjugations, or present-stem classes, of which traces remain in Greek; and there are others preserved in other languages. We must add the aorists and perfect as formations essentially parallel. In most of these we are able to detect an *Aktionsart* originally appropriate to the conjugation, though naturally blurred by later developments. It is seen that the **Point Action;** Aorist has a "punctiliar" action,[1] that is, it regards action as a *point*: it represents the point of entrance (*Ingressive*, as βαλεῖν "let fly," βασιλεῦσαι "come to the throne"), or that of completion (*Effective*, as βαλεῖν "hit"), or it looks at a whole action simply as having occurred, without distinguishing any steps in its progress (*Constative*,[2] as βασιλεῦσαι "reign," or as when a sculptor says of his statue, ἐποίησεν ὁ δεῖνα "X. made it"). On **Action in Perspective;** the same graph, the Constative will be a line reduced to a point by perspective. The Present has generally a *durative* action—"linear," we may call it, to keep up the same graphic **Linear Action;** illustration—as in βάλλειν "to be throwing," βασιλεύειν "to be on the throne." The *Perfect* action is a variety by itself, denoting what **Perfect Action;** began in the past and still continues: thus from the "point" root *weido*, "discover, descry," comes the primitive perfect οἶδα, "I discovered (εἶδον) and still enjoy the results," *i.e.* "I know." The present stems which show an ι-reduplication (ἵστημι, γίγνομαι) are **Iterative Action.** supposed to have started with an *Iterative* action, so that γίγνομαι would originally present the succession of moments which are individually represented by ἐγενόμην. And so throughout the conjugations which are exclusively present. Other conjugations are capable of making both present and aorist stems, as *ἔφην* compared with *ἔβην*, *γράφειν* with *τραπεῖν*, *στένειν* with *γενέσθαι*. In these the pure verb-root is by nature either (*a*) "punctiliar," (*b*) durative, or (*c*) capable of being both. Thus the root of *ἐνεγκεῖν*, like our *bring*, is essentially a "point" word, being classed as "Effective": accordingly it forms no present stem. That of *φέρω*, *fero*, *bear*, on the other hand, is essentially durative or "linear", and therefore forms no aorist stem.[1] So with that of *ἔστι*, *est*, *is*, which has no aorist, while *ἐγενόμην*, as we have seen, had no durative present. An example of the third class is *ἔχω*, which (like our own *have*) is ambiguous in its action. "I had your money" may mean either "I received it" (point action) or "I was in possession of it" (linear action). In Greek the present stem is regularly durative, "to hold," while *ἔσχον* is a point word, "I received": thus, *ἔσχον παρὰ* or *ἀπὸ σοῦ* is the normal expression in a papyrus receipt.[2] Misapprehension of the action-form of *ἔχω* is responsible for most of the pother about *ἔχωμεν* in Rom 5¹. The durative present can only mean "let us enjoy the possession of peace": (*δικαιωθέντες*) *ἔσχομεν εἰρήνην* is the unexpressed antecedent premiss; and Paul wishes to urge his readers to remember and make full use of a privilege which they *ex hypothesi* possess from the moment of their justification. See p. 247.

---

[1] I venture to accept from a correspondent this new-coined word to represent the German *punktuell*, the English of which is preoccupied.

[2] Unity of terminology demands our accepting this word from the German pioneers, and thus supplementing the stores of the *New English Dictionary*. Otherwise one would prefer the clearer word "summary."

Rationale of Defective Verbs.

It is evident that this study of the kind of action denoted by the verbal root, and the modification of that action produced by the formation of tense and conjugation stems, will have considerable influence upon our lexical treatment of the many verbs in which present and aorist are derived from different roots. *Ὁράω* (cognate with our "be*ware*") is very clearly durative wherever it occurs in the NT; and we are at liberty to say that this root, which is incapable of forming an aorist, maintains its character in the perfect, "I have watched, continuously looked upon," while *ὄπωπα* would be "I have caught sight of." *Εἶδον* "I discovered," and *ὤφθην* "I came before the eyes of," are obviously point-words, and can form no present. *Εἶπον* has a similar disability, and we remember at once that its congeners (Ϝ)*ἔπος*, *vox*, Sanskrit *vāc*, etc., describe a single utterance: much the same is true of *ἐρρέθην*, and its cognate nouns (Ϝ)*ῥῆμα*, *verbum*, and *word*. On the other hand, *λέγω*, whose constative aorist *ἔλεξα* is replaced in ordinary language by *εἶπον*, clearly denotes speech in progress, and the same feature is very marked in *λόγος*. The meaning of *λόγος* has been developed in post-Homeric times along lines similar to those on which the Latin *sermo* was produced from the purely physical verb *sero*. One more example we may give, as it leads to our remaining point. *Ἐσθίω* is very obviously durative: *ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ*, Mk 14^{18}, is "he who is taking a meal with me." The root *ed* is so distinctly durative that it forms no aorist, but the punctiliar *φαγεῖν* (originally "to divide") supplies the defect. It will be found that *φαγεῖν* in the NT is invariably constative:[1] it denotes simply the action of *ἐσθίειν* seen in perspective, and not either the beginning or the end of that action. But we find the compound *κατεσθίειν*, *καταφαγεῖν*, used to express the completed act, eating something till it is finished. How little the preposition's proper meaning affects the resulting sense is seen by the fact that what in Greek is *κατεσθίειν* and in Latin "*de*vorare," is in English "eat *up*" and in Latin also "*com*esse." In all the Indo-Germanic languages, most conspicuously and systematically in the Slavonic but clearly enough in our own, this function of verb compounds may be seen. The choice of the preposition which is to produce this *perfective* action[2] depends upon conditions

---

[1] The new aorist (historically perfect) in the Germanic languages (our *bore*) has a constative action.

[2] Note also a petition, Par P 22 (ii/B.C.), in which the tenses are carefully distinguished, as the erasure of an aorist in favour of the imperfect shows. Two women in the Serapeum at Memphis are complaining of their mother, who had deserted her husband for another man: *καὶ τοῦτο ποήσασα οὐκ ἔσχε τὸ τῆς ἀδικησάσης πρόσωπον, ἀλλὰ* $\overset{\text{ζε}}{\text{συνηργάσατο}}$ *ὡς ἐπανελεῖται αὐτὸν ὁ δηλούμενος*, "she did not *put on* the face of the wrong-doer, but (her paramour) began to intrigue with her to destroy (her husband)."

Compounds and *Perfective* Action.

---

[1] There is one apparent exception, Rev 10^{10}, where *ὅτε ἔφαγον αὐτό* is "when I had eaten it up." But *ἔφαγον* is simply the continuation of *κατέφαγον* (see below, p. 115).

[2] One could wish that a term had been chosen which would not have suggested an echo of the tense-name. "Perfective action" has nothing whatever to do with the Perfect tense.

which vary with the meaning of the verbal root. Most of them are capable of "perfectivising" an imperfective verb, when the original adverb's local sense has been sufficiently obscured. We may compare in English the meaning of *bring* and *bring up*, *sit* and *sit down*, *drive* and *drive away* and *drive home*,[1] *knock* and *knock in* and *knock down*, *take* and *overtake* and *take over* and *betake*, *carry* and *carry off* and *carry through*, *work* and *work out* and *work off*, *fiddle* and *fiddle in* (Tennyson's "Amphion"), *set* and *set back* and *set at* and *overset*, *see* and *see to*, *write* and *write off*, *hear* and *hear out*, *break* and *to-break* (Judg 9^{53} AV), *make* and *make over*, *wake* and *wake up*, *follow* and *follow up*, *come* and *come on*, *go* and *go round*, *shine* and *shine away* (= dispel by shining). Among all the varieties of this list it will be seen that the compounded adverb in each case *perfectivises* the simplex, the combination denoting action which has accomplished a result, while the simplex denoted action in progress, or else momentary action to which no special result was assigned. In the above list are included many exx. in which the local force of the adverb is very far from being exhausted. *Drive in*, *drive out*, *drive off*, *drive away*, and *drive home* are alike perfective, but the goals attained are different according to the distinct sense of the adverbs. In a great many compounds the local force of the adverb is so strong that it leaves the action of the verb untouched. The separateness of adverb and verb in English, as in Homeric Greek, helps the adverb to retain its force longer than it did in Latin and later Greek. In both these languages many of the compound verbs have completely lost consciousness of the meaning originally borne by the prepositional element, which is accordingly confined to its perfectivising function. This is especially the case with *com* (*con*) and *ex* (*e*) in Latin, as in *consequi* "follow *out*, attain," *efficere* "work *out*";[2] and with ἀπό,[a] διά, κατά and σύν in Greek, as in ἀποθανεῖν "die" (θνῄσκειν "be dying"), διαφυγεῖν "escape" (φεύγειν = "flee"), καταδιώκειν "hunt *down*" (διώκω = "pursue"),

---

[1] "Prepositions," when compounded, are still the pure adverbs they were at the first, so that this accusative noun turned adverb is entirely on all fours with the rest.

[2] See p. 237.

[[a] See p. 247.

κατεργάζεσθαι "work *out*," *συντηρεῖν* "keep *safe*" (*τηρεῖν* = "watch"). An example may be brought in here to illustrate how this principle works in details of exegesis. In Lk 8^{29} the true force of the pluperfect, combined with the vernacular usage of *πολλοῖς χρόνοις* (see p. 75), goes to show that the meaning is "it had long ago obtained and now kept complete mastery of him." *Συναρπάζω* then, as the perfective of *ἁρπάζω*, denotes not the temporary paroxysm, but the establishment of a permanent hold. The interpretation of *σύν* here depends upon the obvious fact that its normal adverbial force is no longer at work. It is however always possible for the dormant *σύν* to awake, as a glance at this very word in LS will show. "Seize and carry away" is the common meaning, but in *ξυναρπάσασαι τὰς ἐμὰς εἶχον χέρας* (Euripides *Hec.* 1163) we may recognise the original *together*. Probably the actual majority of compounds with these prepositions are debarred from the perfective force by the persistency of the local meaning: in types like *διαπορεύεσθαι, καταβαίνειν, συνέρχεσθαι*, the preposition is still very much alive. And though these three prepositions show the largest proportion of examples, there are others which on occasion can exhibit the perfectivising power. Lightfoot's interpretation brings *ἐπιγινώσκω* under this category. The present simplex, *γινώσκειν*, is durative, "to be taking in knowledge." The simplex aorist has point action, generally *effective*, meaning "ascertain, realise," but occasionally (as in Jn 17^{25}, 2 Tim 2^{19}) it is constative: *ἔγνων σε* gathers into one perspective all the successive moments of *γινώσκωσι σέ* in Jn 17^{3}. *Ἐπιγνῶναι*, "find out, determine," is rather more decisive than the *γνῶναι* (effective); but in the present stem it seems to differ from *γινώσκειν* by including the goal in the picture of the journey there—it tells of knowledge already gained. Thus 1 Co 13^{12} would be paraphrased, "Now I am acquiring knowledge which is only partial at best: then I shall have learnt my lesson, shall *know*, as God in my mortal life knew me." But I confess I lean more and more to Dean Robinson's doctrine (*Ephes.* 248 ff.): the vernacular is rich in *ἐπί* compounds of the kind he describes.

The meaning of the Present-stem of these perfectivised roots naturally demands explanation. Since *θνή-*

Present Stem of *perfectivised* Verbs.

σκειν is "to be dying" and ἀποθανεῖν "to die," what is there left for ἀποθνήσκειν? An analysis of the occurrences of this stem in the NT will anticipate some important points we shall have to make under the heading of Tenses. Putting aside the special use μέλλω ἀποθνήσκειν,[1] we find the present stem used as an *iterative* in 1 Co 15^{31}, and as *frequentative* in Heb 7^{8} 10^{28}, 1 Co 15^{22}, Rev 14^{13}: the latter describes action which recurs from time to time with different individuals, as the iterative describes action repeated by the same agent.[2] In Jn 21^{23} and 1 Co 15^{32} it stands for a future, on which usage see p. 120. Only in Lk 8^{42}, 2 Co 6^{9}, and Heb 11^{21} is it strictly durative, replacing the now obsolete simplex θνήσκω.[3] The simplex, however, vanished only because the "linear perfective" expressed its meaning sufficiently, denoting as it does the whole process leading up to an attained goal. Καταφεύγειν, for example, implies that the refuge is reached, but it depicts the journey there in a *coup d'œil*: καταφυγεῖν is only concerned with the moment of arrival. A very important example in the NT is the recurrent οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι "the perishing." Just as much as ἀποκτείνω and its passive ἀποθνήσκω, ἀπόλλυμαι[4] implies the *completion* of the process of destruction. When we speak of a "dying" man, we do not absolutely bar the possibility of a recovery, but our word implies death as the goal in sight. Similarly in the cry of the Prodigal, λιμῷ ἀπόλλυμαι, Lk 15^{17}, and in that of the disciples in the storm, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα, Mt 8^{25}, we recognise in the perfective verb the sense of an *inevitable* doom, under the visible conditions, even though the subsequent story tells us it was averted. In οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, 1 Co 1^{18} *al*, strongly durative though the verb is, we see perfectivity in the fact that the goal is *ideally* reached: a complete transformation of its subjects is required to bring them out of the ruin implicit in their state.

---

[1] Μέλλω c. pres. inf. occurs eighty-four times in NT; c. fut. thrice in Ac (μ. ἔσεσθαι); c. aor. six times (Ac 12^{6}, Rom 8^{18}, Gal 3^{23}, Rev 3^{2} (ἀποθανεῖν) 3^{16} 12^{4}; also Lk 20^{36} in D and Marcion).

[2] Both will be (. . .), a series of points, on the graph hitherto used.

[3] Τέθνηκα is really the perfect of ἀποθνήσκω: a perfect needed no perfectivising in a "point-word" like this.

[4] Note that in all three the simplex is obsolete, for the same reason in each case.

Preposition not repeated.

Before passing on, we may note the survival in NT Greek of a classical idiom by which the preposition in a compound is omitted, without weakening the sense, when the verb is repeated. Thus in Euripides, *Bacch.* 1065, *κατῆγον, ἦγον, ἦγον*, answers to the English "pulled down, down, down." I do not remember seeing this traced in the NT, but in Rev 10^{10} (*supra*, p. 111 n.) *ἔφαγον* seems to be the continuation of *κατέφαγον*; in Jn 1^{12} *ἔλαβον* takes up *παρέλαβον*, and in Rom 15^{4} *προεγράφη* is repeated as *ἐγράφη*. So also *ἐραυνῶντες* 1 Pet $1^{10f.}$, *ἐνδυσάμενοι* 2 Co 5^{3}, and *στῆναι* Eph 6^{13} (?): add 1 Co 10^{9}, Phil $1^{24f.}$—not, I think, Rom $2^{9f.}$ or Mt $5^{17.\,19}$. The order forbids 1 Co 12^{2}. In all these cases we are justified in treating the simplex as a full equivalent of the compound; but of course in any given case it may be otherwise explicable.

Growth of Constative Aorist,

"The perfective *Aktionsart* in Polybius," the earliest of the great *Κοινή* writers, forms the subject of an elaborate study by Dr Eleanor Purdie, in *Indog. Forsch.* ix. 63–153 (1898). In a later volume, xii. 319–372, H. Meltzer controverts Miss Purdie's results in detail; and an independent comparison with results derivable from NT Greek shows that her conclusions may need considerable qualification. Research in this field is, as Brugmann himself observes (*Griech. Gram.*^{3} 484), still in its initial stages; but that the Newnham philologist is on the right lines generally, is held by some of the best authorities, including Thumb, who thinks her thesis supported by MGr.[a] Her contention is that since Homer the aorist simplex had been progressively taking the constative colour, at the expense of its earlier punctiliar character; and that there is a growing tendency to use the compounds, especially those with *διά, κατά*, and *σύν*, to express what in the oldest Greek could be sufficiently indicated by the simplex. To a certain extent the NT use agrees with that of Polybius. Thus *φυγεῖν* is constative eleven times, "to flee," with no suggestion of the prolongation of flight (*φεύγειν*) or of its successful accom-

and of "Perfective" Compounds.

---

[a] See p. 247.

plishment (*διαφυγεῖν* or *καταφυγεῖν*). (It seems to me clear that in Heb 11^{34} we have *ἔφυγον* for the *beginning* of action,—not the goal of safety attained, but the first and decisive step away from danger. Similarly in Mt 23^{33} we should read "how are ye to *flee from* the judgement of Gehenna?"—just as in 3^{7}. The thought is not of the inevitableness of God's punishment, but of the stubbornness of men who will not take a step to escape it. The perfective therefore would be inappropriate.) The papyri decidedly support this differentiation of simplex and compound. In the same way we find that *διῶξαι* is always constative in NT, while the perfective *καταδιῶξαι*, "hunt down," occurs once in Mk 1^{36}, where "followed after" (AV and RV) is not exact. *Ἐργάσασθαι* is certainly constative in Mt 25^{16}, 3 Jn ^{5}, and Heb 11^{33}: it surveys in perspective the continuous labour which is so often expressed by *ἐργάζεσθαι*. In Mt 26^{10}, and even 2 Jn ^{8}, the same is probably the case: the stress lies on the *activity* rather than on its product. This last idea is regularly denoted by the perfective compound with *κατά*. *Φυλάξαι* "guard" seems always constative, *διαφυλάξαι* "preserve" occurring in Lk 4^{10}. Similarly *τηρῆσαι* "watch, keep," a continuous process seen in perspective: *συν-* and *δια-τηρεῖν* (present stem only) denote "watching" which succeeds up to the point of time contemplated. (See p. 237.) *Ἀγωνίζεσθαι* is only used in the durative present, but *καταγωνίσασθαι* (Heb 11^{33}) is a good perfective. *Φαγεῖν* and *καταφαγεῖν* differ quite on Polybian lines (see above). On the other hand, in the verbs Miss Purdie examines, the NT makes decidedly less use of the compound than does Polybius; while the non-constative aorists which she notes as exceptions to the general tendency are reinforced by others which in Polybius are seldom such. Thus *ἰδεῖν* is comparatively rare in Polybius: "in several cases the meaning is purely constative, and those exx. in which a perfective[1] meaning must be admitted bear a very small proportion to the extremely frequent occurrences of the compound verb in the like sense" (*op. cit.* p. 94 f.). In the NT, however, the simplex *ἰδεῖν* is exceedingly common, while the compound (*καθορᾶν*, Rom 1^{20}) only appears once. It is moreover—so far as I can judge without the labour of a count—as often punctiliar (ingressive) as constative: Mt 2^{10}, "when they caught sight of the star," will serve as an example, against constative uses like that in the previous verse, "the star which they saw." (In numerous cases it would be difficult to distinguish the one from the other.) Here comes in one of Meltzer's criticisms, that the historian's strong dislike of hiatus (cf above, p. 92) accounts for very many of his preferences for compound verbs. This fact undeniably damages the case for Polybius himself; but it does not dispose of inferences—less decided, but not unimportant—which may be drawn from NT Greek and that of the papyri. We are not surprised to find that the NT has no perfective compounds of *θεάομαι, θεωρέω, λογίζομαι, πράσσω, κινδυνεύω, ἄρχομαι, μέλλω, ὀργίζομαι, δύνω* (unless in Col 3^{9}), or *μίσγω* (*μίγνυμι*), to set beside those cited from the historian. *Νοέω* is rather difficult to square with the rule. Its present simplex is often obviously linear, as in *νοῶν καὶ φρονῶν*, the standing phrase of a testator beginning a will: the durative "understand" or "conceive" is the only possible translation in many NT passages. The aor. in Jn 12^{40} and Eph 3^{4} may be the constative of this, or it may be ingressive, "realise." But it is often difficult to make a real perfective out of the compound *κατανοῆσαι*, which should describe the *completion* of a mental process. In some passages, as Lk 20^{23} ("he *detected* their craftiness"), or Ac 7^{31} ("to *master* the mystery"), this will do very well; but the durative action is most certainly represented in the present *κατανοεῖν*, except Ac 27^{39} (? "noticed one after another"). *Μαθεῖν* is sometimes constative, summing up the process of *μανθάνειν*; but it has often purely point action, "ascertain": so in Ac 23^{27}, Gal 3^{2}, and frequently in the papyri. In other places moreover it describes a fully learnt lesson, and not the process of study. On Miss Purdie's principle this should be reserved for *καταμαθεῖν*, which occurs in Mt 6^{28}: both here and for *κατανοήσατε* in the Lucan parallel $12^{24.\,27}$ the RV retains the durative "consider." It may however mean "understand, take in this fact about." The NT use of τελέω, again, differs widely from that of Polybius, where the perfective compound (συντ.) greatly predominates: in NT the simplex outnumbers it fourfold. Moreover the aorist in the NT is always punctiliar ("*finish*"): only in Gal 5[16] is the constative "perform" a possible alternative. Ὀργισθῆναι is another divergent, for instead of the perfective διοργ., "fly into a rage," we six times have the simplex in the NT, where the constative aorist "be angry" never occurs.[1] Finally we note that καθέζεσθαι is always purely durative in NT ("sit," not "sit down," which is καθίσαι), thus differing from Polybian use. A few additions might be made. Thus Lk 19[13] has the simplex πραγματεύσασθαι "trade," with the perfective compound in v.[15] διεπραγματεύσαντο "*gained* by trading." But the great majority of the διά compounds retain the full force of the διά.

---

[1] That is, "punctiliar": Miss Purdie does not distinguish this from perfective proper (with preposition). Brugmann, following Delbrück, has lately insisted on reserving "perfective" for the compounds. Uniformity of terminology is so important that I have altered the earlier phraseology throughout.

Provisional Results.

The net result of this comparison may perhaps be stated thus, provisionally: for anything like a decisive settlement we must wait for some χαλκέντερος grammarian who will toil right through the papyri and the Κοινή literature with a minuteness matching Miss Purdie's over her six books of Polybius—a task for which a year's holiday is a *condicio sine qua non.* The growth of the constative aorist was certainly a feature in the development of later Greek: its consequences will occupy us when we come to the consideration of the Tenses. But the disuse of the "point" aorist, ingressive or effective, and the preference of the perfective compound to express the same meaning, naturally varied much with the author. The general tendency may be admitted as proved; the extent of its working will depend on the personal equation. In the use of compound verbs, especially, we cannot expect the *negligé* style of ordinary conversation, or even the higher degree of elaboration to which Luke or the *auctor ad Hebræos* could rise, to come near the profusion of a literary man like Polybius.[2]

Time and Tense.

Perhaps this brief account of recent researches, in a field hitherto almost untrodden by NT scholars, may suffice to prepare the way for the necessary attempt to place on a scientific basis the use of the tenses, a subject on which many of the most crucial questions of exegesis depend. It has been made clear that the notion of (present or past) *time* is not by any means the first thing we must think of in dealing with tenses. For our problems of *Aktionsart* it is a mere accident that φεύγω is (generally) present and ἔφευγον, ἔφυγον, and φυγών past: the main point we must settle is the distinction between φευγ and φυγ which is common to all their moods.

---

[1] Rev 11[18] might mean "were angry," but the ingressive "waxed angry" (at the accession of the King) suits the context better.

[2] See p. 237.

The Present:— On the Present stem, as normally denoting linear or durative action, not much more need now be said. The reader may be reminded of one idiom which comes out of the linear idea, the use of words like πάλαι with the present in a sense best expressed by our perfect. Thus in 2 Co 12^{19} "have you been thinking all this time?" or Jn 15^{27}, "you have been with me from the beginning." So in MGr, ἐξῆντα μῆνας σ'ἀγαπῶ (Abbott 222). The durative present in such cases gathers up past and present time into one phrase. It must not be thought, however, that the durative meaning monopolises the present stem. In the prehistoric period only certain conjugations had linear action; and though later analogic processes mostly levelled the primitive diversity, there are still some survivals of importance. The punctiliar force is obvious in certain presents. Burton (*MT* 9) cites as "aoristic presents" such words as παραγγέλλω Ac 16^{18}, ἀφίενται Mk 2^{5} ("are this moment forgiven,"—contr. ἀφέωνται Lk 5^{23}), ἰᾶται Ac 9^{34}, etc. So possibly ἀφίομεν Lk 11^{4}, which has ἀφήκαμεν as its representative in Mt. But here it seems better to recognise the *iterative* present—"for we *habitually* forgive": this is like the difference between Lk and Mt seen in their versions of the prayer for daily bread. (Cf also Lk 6^{30}.) Blass (p. 188) adds ἀσπάζεται as the correlative to the regular ἀσπάσασθε. It is very possible that in the prehistoric period a distinct present existed for the strong aorist stem, such as Giles plausibly traces in ἄρχεσθαι compared with the durative ἔρχεσθαι.[1] The conjecture—which is necessarily unverifiable

---

[1] *Manual*² 482. The αρ is like ρα in τραπεῖν against τρέπειν, the familiar Greek representative of the original vocalic *r*.

denoting future time;

and past time;

—would sufficiently explain this verb's punctiliar action. But it may indeed be suspected that point and line action were both originally possible in present and aorist-stem formations which remained without formative prefix or suffix. On this assumption, analogical levelling was largely responsible for the durative character which belongs to most of the special conjugation stems of the present. But this is conjectural, and we need only observe that the punctiliar roots which appear in the present stem have given rise to the use of the so-called present tense to denote future time.[1] In *αὔριον ἀποθνήσκομεν* (1 Co 15[32]) we have a verb in which the perfective prefix has neutralised the inceptive force of the suffix *-ίσκω*: it is only the obsoleteness of the simplex which allows it ever to borrow a durative action. *Εἶμι* in Attic is a notable example of a punctiliar root used for a future in the present indicative. But though it is generally asserted that this use of present tense for future originates in the words with momentary action, this limitation does not appear in the NT examples, any more than in English. We can say, "I am going to London to-morrow" just as well as "I go": and *διέρχομαι* in 1 Co 16[5], *γίνεται* in Mt 26[2], and other futural presents that may be paralleled from the vernacular of the papyri, have no lack of durativity about them. In this stage of Greek, as in our own language, we may define the futural present as differing from the future tense mainly in the tone of assurance which is imparted. That the Present is not primarily a *tense*, in the usual acceptation of the term, is shown not only by the fact that it can stand for future time, but by its equally well-known use as a past. The "Historic" present is divided by Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.*^{3} 484 f.) into the "dramatic" and the "registering" present. The latter registers a date, with words like *γίγνεται*, *τελευτᾷ*, etc. I cannot recall a NT example, for Mt 2[4] is not really parallel. The former, common in all vernaculars—we have only to overhear a servant girl's "so she says to me," if we desiderate proof that the usage is at home among us—is abundantly represented in the NT.[1] From that mine of statistical wealth, Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ*, we find that Mk uses the historic present 151 times, Mt 93 times, Lk 8 times, with 13 in Ac; also that it is rare in the rest of the NT, except in Jn. But it is not true that it was "by no means common in Hellenistic Greek." Sir John Hawkins himself observes that it is common in Josephus and in Job: Mr Thackeray notes 145 exx. in 1 Sam alone—its rarity in LXX was only inferred from the absence of *λέγει*. That Luke invariably (except in 8^{49}) altered Mark's favourite usage means that it was too *familiar* for his liking. I have not catalogued the evidence of the papyri for this phenomenon, but it is common. OP 717 may be cited as a document contemporary with the NT, in which a whole string of presents does duty in narrative. It may be seen alternating with past tenses, as in the NT: cf the curious document Par P 51 (ii/B.C.), recording some extremely trivial dreams. Thus *ἀνύγω . . . ὁρῶ . . . κλαίγω . . . ἐπορευόμην . . . καὶ ἔρχομαι . . . ἔλεγον*, etc. It was indeed a permanent element in prose narrative, whether colloquial or literary;[2] but it seems to have run much the same course as in English, where the historic present is not normally used in educated conversation or in literature as a narrative form. It carries a special effect of its own, which may be a favourite mannerism of a particular author, but entirely avoided by others. Applying this principle, we conceive that Josephus would use the tense as an imitator of the classics, Mark as a man of the people who heard it in daily use around him; while Luke would have Greek education enough to know that it was not common in cultured speech of his time, but not enough to recall the encouragement of classical writers whom he probably never read, and would not have imitated if he had read them. The limits of the historic present are well seen in the fact that it is absent from Homer, not because it was foreign to the old Achaian dialect, but because of its felt incongruity in epic style: it is absent from the *Nibelungenlied* in the same way.

---

[1] Compare the close connexion between *aorist* (not present) subjunctive and the future, which is indeed in its history mainly a specialising of the former.

---

[1] An instructive parallel for λέγει Ἰησοῦς, especially as in the Oxyrhynchus Logia, may be seen in Roman edicts. Thus *Syll.* 376 Καῖσαρ (Nero) λέγει; *ib.* 656 (ii/A.D.—a proconsul); *OGIS* 665 (49 A.D.), etc.

[2] A peculiar use of the historic present is noticeable in MGr, where it frequently takes up a past tense: thus, ὁ Τσόλκας ἐξεσπάθωσε, κράζει τὰ παλληκάρια, "drew his sword and calls" (Abbott 44—see also 22, 26, etc.). See p. 139 n.

Present and Aorist in Prohibitions:

in Modern Greek;

in Papyri;

The Moods of the present stem will be treated under their separate heads later. But there are two uses which should come in here, as bearing on the kind of action belonging to the tense-stem. The first concerns the two normal methods of expressing Prohibition in classical Greek, which survive in NT Greek, though less predominant than before. There is a familiar rule that μή is used with present imperative or aorist subjunctive; but the distinction between these, expounded by Gottfried Hermann long ago, seems to have been mostly unnoticed till it was rediscovered by Dr Walter Headlam in *CR* xvii. 295, who credits Dr Henry Jackson with supplying the hint. Dr Jackson himself contributes a brief but suggestive note in xviii. 262 f. (June 1904), and Dr Headlam then writes in full upon the subject in xix. 30–36, citing the dicta of Hermann from which the doctrine started, and rebutting some objections raised by Mr H. D. Naylor.[a] Dr Jackson's words may be cited as linking the beginning and end of the language-history, and proving incidentally that the alleged distinction must hold for the NT language, which lies midway. "Davidson told me that, when he was learning modern Greek, he had been puzzled about the distinction, until he heard a Greek friend use the present imperative to a dog which was barking. This gave him the clue. He turned to Plato's *Apology*, and immediately stumbled upon the excellent instances 20E μὴ θορυβήσητε, before clamour begins, and 21A μὴ θορυβεῖτε, when it has begun." The latter means in fact "desist from interrupting," the former "do not interrupt (in future)." Headlam shows how the present imperative often calls out the retort, "But I am not doing so," which the aorist locution never does: it would require "No, I will not." This is certainly the case in MGr, where μὴ γράφῃς is addressed to a person who is already writing, μὴ γράψῃς to one who has not begun. The facts for classical and for present-day Greek may be supplemented from the four volumes of OP: we need not labour the proof of a canon which could hardly be invalid for a period lying between periods in which it is known to have been in force. I have noted in OP six cases of *μή* c. aor. subj. referring to requests made in a letter, which of course cannot be attended to till the letter arrives. Thus *μὴ ἀμελήσῃς*, *μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσῃς*, *ὅρα μηδενὶ . . . προσκρούσῃς*, etc. (all ii/A.D.). One other (OP 744, i/B.C.) is worth quoting as a sample of such requests followed by a reply: *εἴρηκας . . . ὅτι Μή με ἐπιλάθῃς. Πῶς δύναμαί σε ἐπιλαθεῖν;* On the other hand, we have four cases of *μή* c. pres. imper., all clearly referable to the rule. *Τοῦτο μὴ λέγε* (what he *had* said)—*μὴ ἀγωνία* (*bis*) "don't go on worrying"—*μὴ σκλύλλε ἑατὴν ἐνπῆναι* (*sic!*) "don't bother to give information (??)": in the last case (295—i/A.D.) the writer had apparently left school young, and we can only guess her meaning, but it may well be "stop troubling." As we shall see, the crux is the differentia of the present imperative, which is not easy to illustrate decisively from the papyri. Hb P 56 (iii/B.C.) *σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐνόχλει αὐτόν* (as you are doing) is good. FP 112 (i/A.D.)—the only case there—is obscured by hiatus. The prevalence of reports and accounts in Tb P i. gives little opportunity for the construction; but in the royal edict Tb P 6 (ii/B.C.), we find *καὶ μηθενὶ ἐπιτρέπετε καθ' ὁντινοῦν τρόπον πράσσειν τι τῶν προδεδηλωμένων*, the conformity of which with the rule is suggested by the words "as we have before commanded," with which the sentence apparently opens: a hiatus again causes difficulty. The frequency of these prohibitions in NT presents a very marked contrast to the papyri, but the hortatory character of the writing accounts for this. The following table gives the statistics for *μή* with the 2nd person:—

---

[a] See p. 247.

and in NT.

	c. pres. imp.	c. aor. subj.
Mt.	12	29
Mk	8	9
Lk.	27	19
Ac.	5	4
Jn and Epp	19	1
Rev	3	5
Paul	47	8
Heb	5	5
Jas.	7	2
1 Pet	1	2
	134	84

We have included the cases where *μή* is preceded by *ὅρα* or the like. But sometimes this is not (as in the Gospels) a mere compound prohibition, like our "take care not to . . ." In Gal 5^{15} "take heed lest" can hardly be classed as a prohibition at all; while in Mk 1^{44}, *ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς*, there is virtual parataxis, *ὅρα* being only a sort of particle adding emphasis. The analysis of the list raises several suggestive points. In Mt we note that except 1^{20} and 3^{9} all the examples are from sayings of Christ, 39 in all, while in Lk 32 are thus described (36 if we include a citation of four precepts from the Decalogue). Since Mt has 12 pres. to 27 aor., but Lk 21 to 11, we see that there was no sort of uniformity in translating from the Aramaic. There is no case where Mt and Lk have varied the tense while using the same word in reporting the same logion;[1] but we find Mt altering Mk in 24^{23}, manifestly for the better, if the canon is true. In Mk the balance is heavily inclined to the pres., for 5 out of 9 aor. examples are in the recitation of the commandments. In Jn there is only one aor., 3^{7}, an exception the more curious in that *desine mirari* seems clearly the meaning; but see below. Paul uses the aor. even less than he appears to do, for Rom 10^{6} is a quotation, and Col 2^{21} *ter* virtually such: this leaves only 2 Th 3^{13}, 1 Tim 5^{1}, 2 Tim 1^{8}, with Gal 5^{15}, on which see above. Heb has only two aorists (10^{35} 12^{25}—the latter with *βλέπετε*), apart from a triple quotation $3^{8.\ 15}$ 4^{7}. The very marked predominance of the *μὴ ποίει* type is accordingly unbroken except in Mt, and in Rev and 1 Pet so far as they go. In the NT as a whole the proportion is 61 p.c. to 39, which does not greatly differ from the 56 to 44 noted in the Attic Orators by Miller (*AJP* xiii. 423).

Passages agreeing.

Before we proceed to draw our deductions from the canon thus applied to the NT, it will be well to present a few of the passages in which it obviously holds. In the following places the reply to the *μὴ ποίει* must clearly be either "I am not doing so" or "I will stop doing it":—Mk 5^{36}

---

[1] D uses *κωλύσητε* in Lk 18^{16}, where Mt and Mk, as well as the other MSS in Lk, have the much more appropriate present.

9^{39} and parallels, Lk 7^{13} 8^{49} 8^{52} (cf Mk *τί κλαίετε;*) 10^{20} 11^{7} 14^{12} 23^{28}, Jn 2^{16} 5^{14} 19^{21} $20^{17.\ 27}$, Ac 10^{15} 18^{9} 20^{10}, Rom $11^{18.\ 20}$ 14^{20}, 1 Co 7^{27}, 1 Tim 5^{23}, Jas 2^{1}, 1 Pet 4^{12}, Rev 5^{5}. In the following, the *μὴ ποιήσῃς* would be answered with "I will avoid doing so":—Mt 6^{13} 10^{9} 17^{9}, Mk 8^{26} 9^{25}, Lk 6^{29} 10^{4} (contrast the two prohibitions) 14^{8} 21^{8}, Ac 7^{60} 9^{38} 16^{28} 23^{21}, 1 Tim 5^{1}, 2 Tim 1^{8}, Rev 6^{6} 7^{3} 10^{4} (following *ἤμελλον γράφειν*—he had not begun).

Difficulties. It must however be admitted that rather strong external pressure is needed to force the rule upon Paul. It is not merely that his usage is very one-sided. So is that of Jn, and yet (with the doubtful exception of 10^{37}) every present he uses fits the canon completely. But does *μὴ ἀμέλει* in 1 Tim 4^{14} require us to believe that Timothy *was* "neglecting" his "charism"—*μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει* and *μηδὲ κοινώνει* in 5^{22}, that he was warned to stop what he was hitherto guilty of? May we not rather say that *μὴ ἀμέλει* is equivalent to *πάντοτε μελέτα* or the like, a marked *durative*, with a similar account of *μηδὲ κοινώνει*? If we paraphrase the first clause in 5^{22} "always be deliberate in choosing your office-bearers," we see the *iterative*[1] force of the present coming in; and this we recognise again in typical passages like Lk 10^{7}, Rom 6^{13}, Eph 4^{26}, Heb 13^{9}, 2 Jn^{10}, 1 Jn 4^{1}. Then in 1 Co 14^{39} how are we to imagine Paul bidding the Corinthians "desist from forbidding" the exercise of their darling charism? His *μὴ κωλύετε* means "do not discourage glossolaly, as after my previous words you might be inclined to do." In other words, we have the *conative*,[1] which is clearly needed also in such passages as Gal 5^{1}. *Μὴ ποίει* accordingly needs various mental supplements, and not one only. It is "Stop doing," or "Do not (from time to time)," or "Do not (as you are in danger of doing)," or "Do not attempt to do." We are not justified in excluding, for the purposes of the present imperative in prohibitions, the various kinds of action which we find attached to the present stem elsewhere.

---

[1] See below, p. 128. In 1 Co *l.c.* we might also trace the iterative, if the meaning is "Do not repress glossolaly, whenever it breaks out." So Dr Findlay. Dr Abbott (*JG* 318 ff.) cites Mk 13^{21} against the "Do not persist" rule; and Mr Naylor points to the *ἔτι* required in 1 Ti 5^{22}.

But since the simple linear action is by far the commonest in the present stem, it naturally follows that *μὴ ποίει* usually means "stop doing," though (as Headlam admits, *CR* xix. 31) it does not always mean this. To account for such difficulties on the other side as Jn 3^{7}, we may well pursue the quotation from the scholar who started us on this discussion. "*Μὴ δράσῃς* always, I believe, means *I warn you against doing this, I beseech you will not*; though this is sometimes used when the thing is being done; notably in certain cases which may be called colloquial or idiomatic, with an effect of impatience, *μὴ φροντίσῃς Oh, never mind! μὴ δείσῃς Never fear! μὴ θαυμάσῃς You mustn't be surprised.*"

Why Paul prefers μὴ ποίει.

One of my main motives in pursuing this long discussion has been to solve a question that has consequences for our Church History. What are we to infer when we find Paul bidding his converts *μὴ μεθύσκεσθε* (Eph 5^{18}), *μὴ ψεύδεσθε* (Col 3^{9}), or James changing the logion of Mt $5^{34. 36}$ into the suggestive present (5^{12})? What has been said will make it clear that such commands were very practical indeed,—that the apostles were not tilting at windmills, but uttering urgent warnings against sins which were sure to reappear in the Christian community, or were as yet only imperfectly expelled. The critics who make so much of lapses among Christian converts of the first generation in modern missions might have damned Paul's results with equal reason. Time has shown—time will show.[1]

Present Participle.

The second point in which we shall anticipate later discussion concerns the uses of the Participle. Like the rest of the verb, outside the indicative, it has properly no sense of time attaching to it: the linear action in a participle, connected with a finite verb in past or present time, partakes in the time of its principal. But when the participle is isolated by the addition of the article, its proper timelessness is free to come out. This can hardly happen with the aorist, where point action in such a connexion cannot well exist without the suggestion of past time: *ἡ τεκοῦσα* must be rendered "she who *bore* a child," not because *τεκοῦσα* is past in time like ἔτεκε, but because the action is not in progress and therefore must be past. But ἡ τίκτουσα is common in tragedy (cf Gal 4^{27}) as a practical synonym of ἡ μήτηρ, the title of a continuous relationship. Winer (p. 444) gives a good selection of classical exx.: add from the papyri such as CPR 24 etc. (ii/A.D.) τοῖς γαμοῦσι, "the contracting parties," who are called οἱ γεγαμηκότες in a similar document, CPR 28 (ii/A.D.). So ὁ κλέπτων, Eph 4^{28}, is not "he who stole" or "he who steals," but simply "the stealer," differing from ὁ κλέπτης "the thief" only in being more closely associated with the verb κλεπτέτω which is coming. If the Baptist is called ὁ βαπτίζων (Mk $6^{14.\ 24}$), "the baptiser," the phrase is less of a technical term than the noun, but is otherwise synonymous therewith. An agent-noun almost necessarily connotes linear action: there are only a few exceptions, like "murderer," "bankrupt," where the title is generally given in respect of an act committed in the past. Hence it coincides closely with the action of the present participle, which with the article (rarely without—see Kühner-Gerth i. 266) becomes virtually a noun. We return to the aorist participle later, and need not say more on the minute part of its field which might be connected with the subject of this paragraph. But it must be remarked that the principle of a timeless *present* participle needs very careful application, since alternative explanations are often possible, and grammar speaks to exegesis here with no decisive voice. In my *Introduction* ² (p. 199) Mt 27^{40}, ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν, "the destroyer of the temple," was given as an ex. of a participle turned noun. But the *conative* force is not to be missed here: "you would-be destroyer" gives the meaning more exactly. Another ambiguous case may be quoted from Heb 10^{14}: is τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους timeless, "the objects of sanctification," or iterative, "those who from time to time receive sanctification," or purely durative, "those who are in process of sanctification"? The last, involving a suggestive contrast with the perfect τετελείωκεν—telling (like the unique ἐστὲ σεσῳσμένοι of Eph $2^{5.\ 8}$) of a work which is finished on its Author's side, but progressively realised by its objects,—brings the tense into relation with the recurrent οἱ σῳζόμενοι and οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, in which durative action is conspicuous.

---

[1] See p. 238.

The examples will suffice to teach the importance of caution.

The Imperfect. We turn to the Imperfect, with which we enter the sphere of Tense proper, the idea of past time being definitely brought in by the presence of the augment. This particle—perhaps a demonstrative base in its origin, meaning "then"—is the only decisive mark of past or present time that the Indo-Germanic verb possesses, unless the final *-i* in primary tenses is rightly conjectured to have denoted present action in its prehistoric origin. Applied to the present stem, the augment throws linear action into the past; applied to the aorist, it does the same for punctiliar action. The resultant meaning is naturally various. We may have pictorial narrative, as contrasted with the summary given by the aorist. Thus the sculptor will sometimes sign his work ὁ δεῖνα ἐποίει, sometimes ἐποίησε: the former lays the stress on the labour of production, the latter on the artist's name. When the difference is a matter of emphasis, we naturally find it sometimes evanescent. Ἔφη, imperfect in form, is aorist in meaning, because φᾱ is a punctiliar root. But ἔλεγεν often differs very little from εἶπεν—its pictorial character is largely rubbed off by time, and in MGr the two forms are mere equivalents. In words less worn the distinction can hardly ever be ignored. The categories to which we were alluding just now, in discussing the participle, are everywhere conspicuous in the imperfect indicative. Thus we have frequently the *iterative*, its graph (......) instead of (——), describing past action that was repeated. Especially important, because more liable to be missed, is the *conative* imperfect, for which we might give the graph (——   ). Action going on implies the contingency of its failure to reach an end: our linear graph may either be produced beyond our vision, or reach a definite terminus in view (κατήσθιον, perfective, see above, p. 111), or stop abruptly *in vacuo*. How important this is for the NT may be seen from some of the passages in which the Revisers have earned our gratitude by their careful treatment of the Tenses, a specially strong point of their work. Ac 26[11] is a notable example: the AV commits Paul to the statement that he had actually forced weak Christians to renounce their Master

Now in itself *ἠνάγκαζον* might of course be "I repeatedly forced," the iterative imperfect just referred to. But the sudden abandonment of the aorist, used up to this point, gives a strong grammatical argument for the alternative "I tried to force," which is made certain by the whole tone of the Apostle in his retrospect: we cannot imagine him telling of such a success so calmly![a] Other typical exx. are Mt 3^{14}, Lk 1^{59}, Ac 7^{26}, the RV being right in all: in Ac *l.c.* the AV curiously blundered into the right meaning by mistranslating a wrong text. (Their *συνήλασεν* would naturally mean that he "drove" them to shake hands! Did the translators (Tyndale and his successors) mistake this for *συνήλλασσεν*, or did they consciously emend? The Vulgate *reconciliabat* may have encouraged them.) In Mk 9^{38} the Revisers unfortunately corrected the text without altering the translation: it seems clear that the imperfect is conative, the man refusing to be stopped in his good work. So also in Heb 11^{17} *προσέφερεν* appears to be a conative imperfect, as the RV takes it: the contrast between the ideally accomplished sacrifice, as permanently recorded in Scripture (*προσενήνοχεν*), and the historic fact that the deed was not finished, makes an extremely strong case for this treatment of the word. I cannot therefore here agree with Thumb, who says that we expect an aorist, and suggests that *ἔφερον* had already begun to be felt as an aorist as in MGr *ἔφερα*, the aorist of *φέρνω* (*ThLZ* xxviii. 423). He cites no ancient parallel;[1] and of all NT writers the author of Heb is the least likely to start an innovation of this kind.[b] (See p. 238.)

The Aorist:— In the Aorist indicative, as in the Imperfect, we have past time brought in by the use of the augment. To appreciate the essential character of aorist action, therefore, we must start with the other moods. The contrast of its point action with the linear of the present stem is well seen in *δὸς σήμερον* in Mt 6^{11}, against *δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* in Lk 11^{3}: cf also Mt 5^{42} *τῷ αἰτοῦντι δός*, but *παντὶ αἰτοῦντι δίδου* in Lk 6^{30}; and (with respective parts reversed) Mt 5^{12} *χαίρετε*, without note of time, but Lk 6^{23} *χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*. The Imperative shows the contrast so well that we may add another example:[c] Rom 6^{13} gives us present *παριστάνετε* (see pp. 122 ff.) and *παραστήσατε* together in marked antithesis—the daily struggle, always ending in surrender, and the once-for-all surrender to God which brings deliverance. Note further the delicate *nuance* in Ac $15^{37f.}$: Barnabas, with easy forgetfulness of risk, wishes *συνπαραλαβεῖν* Mark—Paul refuses *συνπαραλαμβάνειν*, to have with them day by day one who had shown himself unreliable. Examples are very numerous, and there are few of the finer shades of meaning which are more important to grasp, just because they usually defy translation. The three kinds of point action, Ingressive, Effective, and Constative,[1] are not always easy to distinguish. Two or even three of them may be combined in one verb, as we saw above with *βαλεῖν* (p. 109); for of course this may be the summary of *βάλλειν* "throw," as well as "let fly" and "hit". In usage however nearly all verbs keep to one end or other of the action; though the marked growth of the constative enlarges the number of cases in which the whole action is comprised in one view. Thus from *βασιλεύειν* we have the ingressive aorist in *βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται*, "having *come to his throne* he shall rest" (Agraphon, OP 654 and Clem. Al.), and the constative in Rev 20^4 "they *reigned* a thousand years." The ingressive especially belongs to verbs of state or condition (Goodwin *MT* 16).[2] For the effective aorist, we may compare durative *τελεῖν* "fulfil, bring to perfection" (2 Co 12^9 "my power *is being perfected* in weakness") with the aorist *τελέσαι* "finish" (Lk 2^{39} etc.): for constative in Gal 5^{16} see above, p. 118.

---

[1] *Φέρετε* in Hb P 45 might serve. So possibly Mk 11^{2}. [[a b c] See p. 247.

Classified.

Aorist Participle of Coincident Action.

The aorist participle raises various questions of its own, which must be considered here in so far as they concern the nature of aorist action. The connotation of past time has largely fastened on this participle, through the idiomatic use in which it stands before an aorist indicative to qualify its action. As point action is always completed action, except in the ingressive, the participle naturally came to involve past time relative to that of the main verb. Presumably this would happen less completely when the participle stood second. The assumption of past time must not however be regarded as a necessary or an accomplished process. In many cases, especially in the NT, the participle and the main verb denote *coincident* or *identical* action. So *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* Mt 22^{1} etc.,[1] *καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος* Ac 10^{33}. The latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri: thus FP 121 (i/ii A.D.) *εὖ ποιήσεις δούς* "you will oblige me by giving"—*si dederis* in Latin. In Jn 11^{28} we have *εἰποῦσα* first for past action and then *εἴπασα* (BC*) for coincident: the changed form is suggestive, but is perhaps without conscious significance. One probable example of coincident action may be brought in here because of its inherent difficulty, though it belongs rather to lexicon than to grammar. The participle *ἐπιβαλών* (Mk 14^{72})—which may well have been obscure even to Mt and Lk. who both dropped it—has now presented itself in the Ptolemaic papyrus Tb P 50, *ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν τὰ ἐν τῆι ἑαυτοῦ γῆι μέρη τοῦ σημαινομένου ὑδραγωγοῦ*, which I translate, "he set to and dammed up." It is true that in Tb P 13 *ἐπιβολή* means "embankment," as Dr Swete has pointed out to me.[2] But Dr F. G. Kenyon has since observed that if *ἐπιβάλλω* were here used of casting up earth, it would add nothing to *συνέχωσεν* alone. Moreover, since Mark's phrase has to be explained in any case, there is good reason for taking the word in the same sense in both places. Many versions either take this view of *ἐπιβαλών* (cf Euthymius' gloss *ἀρξάμενος*), or translate the paraphrase *ἤρξατο* found in D. Mt and Lk substitute the ingressive aorist *ἔκλαυσεν*. If this account is right, *ἐπιβαλών* is the aorist coincident with the first point of the linear *ἔκλαιεν*, and the compound phrase expresses with peculiar vividness both the initial paroxysm and its long continuance, which the easier but tamer word of the other evangelists fails to do.

---

[1] We may express them by the graph A ——>—— B, denoting motion from A to B. A will be Ingressive, B Effective, and the Constative would be the line reduced to a point by perspective.

[2] Thus ἀποδημεῖν = live abroad ; ἀπεδήμησεν = went abroad, Lk 15^{13}, Ll P 1 (iii/B.C.) with date of leaving.

---

[1] This phrase, except for Ac 19^{15} 25^{9}, occurs in the Semitic atmosphere alone; so that we should look at the Hebrew וַיַּעַן וַיֹּאמֶר, which suggested it through the medium of the LXX. (It is not Aramaic, Dalman thinks, *Words* 24 f.) The form of the Hebrew prompts Dr Findlay to suggest that *ἀποκριθεὶς* is *ingressive*, *εἶπεν consecutive* upon it. It is not fatal that *ἀποκριθῆναι* is generally constative. We should note here Ac 19^{2}, where the coincident aor. ptc. is doctrinally important: cf RV.

[2] See notes in *Expos* VI. vii. 113 and viii. 430

No Evidence for that of Subsequent Action.

There are even cases where the participle seems to involve *subsequent* action. Thus in Pindar *Pyth.* iv. 189 we have, "when the flower of his sailor-folk came down to Iolcos, Jason *mustered and thanked* them all (λέξατο ἐπαινήσαις)." This is really *coincident* action, as Gildersleeve notes; but of course, had the poet felt bound to chronicle the exact order of proceedings, he would have put the muster first. I am strongly disposed to have recourse to this for the much-discussed ἀσπασάμενοι in Ac 25^{13}, though Hort's suspicions of "prior corruption" induce timidity. It might seem more serious still that Blass (p. 197) pronounces "the reading of the majority of the MSS . . . not Greek,"[1] for Blass came as near to an Athenian *revenant* as any modern could hope to be. But when he says that the "accompanying circumstance . . . cannot yet be regarded as concluded," may we not reply that in that case Pindar's ἐπαινήσαις equally needs emending? The effective aorist κατήντησαν is very different from a durative like ἐπορεύοντο, which could only have been followed by a word describing the purpose before them on their journey. But in "they arrived on a complimentary visit" I submit that the case is really one of *identical* action. The RV *text* gives the meaning adequately.[2] There are a good many NT passages in which exegesis has to decide between antecedent and coincident action, in places where the participle stands second: Heb 9^{12} will serve as an example. It would take too much space to discuss adequately the alleged examples of *subsequent* action participles for which Ramsay pleads (*Paul*, p. 212), but a few comments must be ventured. In Ac 16^{6} (WH)—the first of a series of passages which Rackham (*Acts*, p. 184) regards as "decisive"—we really have nothing to show *when* the Divine monition was given. Assuming Ramsay's itinerary correct, and supposing that the travellers realised the prohibition as far on as Pisidian Antioch, the aorist remains *coincident*, or even antecedent, for they had not yet crossed the Asian frontier. In 23^{35} (and 22^{24}) it is entirely arbitrary to make assumptions as to the order of the items. The former is "he said . . ., meanwhile ordering him . . .," which may perfectly well mean that Felix first told his soldiers where they were to take Paul, and then assured the prisoner of an early hearing, just before the guards led him away. In 22^{24} Lysias presumably said in one sentence, "Bring him in and examine him." In 17^{26} the *ὁρίσας* is not "later" than the *ἐποίησεν* in time: the determination of man's home *preceded* his creation, in the Divine plan. Rackham's other "decisive" exx. are 24^{22}, in which *εἴπας* and *διαταξάμενος* are items in the action described by *ἀνεβάλετο*; and 7^{36}, where the constative *ἐξήγαγεν* describes the Exodus as a whole. Rackham's object is to justify the reading of ℵBHLP *al* in 12^{25}, by translating "they returned to J. and fulfilled their ministry and took with them John." Now "returned . . . in fulfilment . . ." is a good coincident aorist and quite admissible. But to take *συνπαραλαβόντες* in this way involves an unblushing aorist of *subsequent* action, and this I must maintain has not yet been paralleled either in the NT or outside. Hort's conjecture —*τὴν εἰς Ἰ. πληρώσαντες διακονίαν*—mends this passage best. The alternative is so flatly out of agreement with the normal use of the aorist participle that the possibility of it could only introduce serious confusion into the language. Prof. Ramsay's appeal to Blass will not lie, I think, for any "subsequent action" use: we have already referred to the great grammarian's *non possumus* for Ac 25^{13}, which entirely bars his assent to any interpretation involving more than coincident action. All that he says on 23^{35} is that *κελεύσας* = *ἐκέλευσέν τε*, which is not warrant for Ramsay's inference.

---

[1] Blass here slurs over the fact that *not one uncial* reads the future. The paraphrastic rendering of the Vulgate cannot count, and a reading supported by nothing better than the cursive 61 had better be called a conjecture outright. (Blass's misquotation κατῆλθον, by the way, is not corrected in his second edition.) As little can I share his confidence that Jn 11^{2} "is certainly an interpolation" (p. 198 n.). What difficulty is there in the explanation he quotes, "who *as is well known* did (or, has done) this"! (See p. 238.)

[2] We may quote an example from the vernacular: OP 530 (ii/A.D.) ἐξ ὧν δώσεις Σαραπίωνι τῷ φίλῳ . . . λυτρώσασά μου τὰ ἱμάτια δρ. ἑκατόν, "of which you will give 'my uncle' Sarapion 100 drachmæ *and redeem* my clothes." We should add that Dr Findlay would regard ἀσπ. in Ac *l.c.* as denoting the *initial act* of **κατήντησαν.** See further p. 238.

On the whole case, we may safely accept the vigorous statement of Schmiedel on Ac 16[6] (*EB* ii. 1599): "It has to be maintained that the participle must contain, if not something antecedent to 'they went' (διῆλθον), at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up."[1]

Timeless Aorists.

The careful study of the aorist participle will show surviving uses of its original timeless character, besides those we have noted already. Lk 10[18] *ἐθεώρουν* (durative) *τὸν Σατανᾶν . . . ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*,—which is nearly like Aeschylus *PV* 956 f.,

οὐκ ἐκ τῶνδ᾽ ἐγὼ [sc. *περγάμων*]
δισσοὺς τυράννους ἐκπεσόντας ᾐσθόμην,[2]

or Homer *Il.* vi. 284 (also, however, with aorist in the main verb),

εἰ κεῖνόν γε Ϝίδοιμι κατελθόντ᾽ Ἄϊδος εἴσω—

belongs to a category of which many exx. are given by Goodwin *MT* § 148, in which the sense of past time does not appear: cf Monro *HG* 212, 401. "I watched him fall" will be the meaning, the aorist being constative: *πίπτοντα* "falling" (cf Vulg. *cadentem*) would have been much weaker, suggesting the possibility of recovery. The triumphant *ἔπεσεν ἔπεσεν* of Rev 18[2] (cf next page) is the same action. We need not stay to show the timelessness of the aorist in the imperative, subjunctive and infinitive: there never was any time connotation except when in reported speech an optative or infinitive aorist took the place of an indicative. Cases where an aorist indicative denotes present time, or even future, demand some attention. *Ἐβλήθη* in Jn 15[6] is paralleled by the well-known classical idiom seen in Euripides *Alc.* 386, *ἀπωλόμην εἴ με λείψεις*, "*I am undone* if you leave me."[3][a] Similarly in *ἐξέστη*, Mk 3[21], English again demands the perfect, "he has gone out of his mind." Jannaris *HG* § 1855 notes that this idiom survives in MGr. In Rom 14[23] an analogous use of the perfect may be seen. The difficult aorist of Mk 1[11] and parallels, *ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα*, is probably "on thee I have set the seal of my approval": literally "I set," at a time which is not defined. None of these exx. are really in present time, for they only seem to be so through a difference in idiom between Greek and English. We have probably to do here with one of the most ancient uses of the aorist—the ordinary use in Sanskrit—expressing what has *just happened*:[a] cf Mk 16^{6}, Lk 7^{16} 14^{20} 15^{32} 24^{34}, Jn 11^{42} 12^{19} 13^{1} (*ἦλθεν*) 13^{31} 21^{10}, Rev 14^{8} 18^{2}, etc., and see p. 140.[1] In two other uses we employ the present, the "epistolary" (as Eph 6^{22}), and the so-called "gnomic" aorist. Goodwin (*MT* § 155) observes that the gnomic aorist and perfect "give a more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in the past to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred is likely to occur again under similar circumstances." The present is much commoner than the aorist,[2] which generally (Goodwin § 157) refers to "a single or a sudden occurrence, while the present (as usual) implies duration." The gnomic aorist survives in MGr (Jannaris *HG* § 1852), and need not have been denied by Winer for Jas 1^{11} and 1 Pet 1^{24}: see Hort's note on the latter. Jas 1^{24} combines aor. and perf. in a simile, reminding us of the closely allied Homeric aorist in similes.

---

[1] Ac 21[14] may be rendered "we ceased, with the words . . ."

[2] Suggested by my friend Mr H. Bisseker.

[3] See Giles, *Manual*² 499. [[a] See p. 247.

English Rendering of Aorist Indicative.

This is not, however, the only usage in which the Greek has to be rendered in English idiom by what we call our Perfect Tense. Our English Past—historically a syncretic tense, mostly built on the Perfect—is essentially a *definite* tense, connoting always some point or period of time at which the action occurred. But in Greek this is not necessarily involved at all. Idiomatically we use the past in pure narrative, where the framework of the story implies the continuous dating of the events; and though the Greek aorist has not this implication, we may regard the tenses as equivalent in practice But outside narrative we use the periphrastic *have* tense as an

---

[1] In classical Greek we may find an aorist of this kind used with a sequence which would naturally suggest a foregoing perfect, as Euripides, *Medea*, 213 f.: *ἐξῆλθον δόμων μή μοί τι μέμφησθ'*. See Verrall's note.

[2] In the important article quoted below (p. 247, additional note upon p. 115), Prof. Thumb observes that the perfectivising preposition enabled a present or imperfect to replace the gnomic aorist in similes. [[a] See p. 247.

indefinite past; and it thus becomes the inevitable representative of the Greek aorist when no time is clearly designed: *e.g* 1 Co 15[6] τινὲς ἐκοιμήθησαν, "fell asleep (at various times)," and so "have fallen asleep." This has two unfortunate results. We have to decide for ourselves whether a Greek aorist refers to definite or indefinite time—often no easy task. And we have to recognise that our own perfect is ambiguous: it is not only the genuine Perfect, describing action in the past with continuance into present time, but also the simple indefinite Past. As Dr J. A. Robinson says (*Gospels*, p. 107), on ἔκρυψας and ἀπεκάλυψας in Mt 11[25]: "If we render, 'Thou didst hide . . . Thou didst reveal,' . . . our minds are set to search for some specially appropriate moment to which reference may be made. The familiar rendering, 'Thou hast hid . . . Thou hast revealed,' expresses the sense of the Greek far more closely, though we are using what we call a 'perfect.' The fact needs to be recognised that our simple past and our perfect tense do not exactly coincide in meaning with the Greek aorist and perfect respectively. The translation of the aorist into English must be determined partly by the context and partly by considerations of euphony."[1] The use of the English perfect to render the aorist evidently needs careful guarding, lest the impression of a true perfect be produced. Take for example Rom 1[5]. The AV "we have received" decidedly rings as a perfect: it means "I received originally and still possess." This lays the emphasis on the wrong element, for Paul clearly means that when he did receive a gift of grace and a commission from God, it was *through Christ* he received it. This is not an indefinite aorist at all. If a man says to his friend, "Through you I got a chance in life," we should never question the idiom: "have got" would convey a distinct meaning. Among the paraphrasers of Rom, Moffatt and the *Twentieth Century NT* rightly give the past tense here with the RV: Rutherford, Way and Weymouth less accurately give the perfect. The limitations of our idiom are evident in the contrasted tenses of Mk 16[6] and 1 Co 15[4]. *Ἠγέρθη* states simply the past complete fact, the astounding news of what had just happened—see above on this use of the aorist. *Ἐγήγερται* sets forth with the utmost possible emphasis the abiding results of the event, which supply the main thought of the whole passage. But "He is risen" is the only possible translation for the former; while in the latter, since a definite time is named, our usage rather rebels against the perfect which the sense so strongly demands. We must either sacrifice this central thought with the AV and the free translators, who had a chance that was denied to the literal versions, or we must frankly venture on "translation English" with the RV: to fit our idiom we might detach the note of time and say "that he hath been raised —raised on the third day, according to the scriptures."

---

[1] This thesis was elaborately worked out by Dr R. F. Weymouth in a pamphlet, *On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect* (1890: since in 2nd ed.). His posthumous *NT in Modern Speech* was intended to give effect to the thesis of the pamphlet. Weymouth's argument is damaged by some not very wise language about the RV; but in this one point it may be admitted that the Revisers' principles were (very rarely) applied in rather too rigid a manner. See however pp. 137 ff.

AV and RV in Mt.

The subject of the rendering of the Greek aorist is so important that no apology is needed for an extended enquiry. We will examine the usage of AV and RV in Mt, which will serve as a typical book. If my count is right, there are 65 indicative aorists in Mt which are rendered by both AV and RV alike with the English perfect,[1] or in a few cases the present; while in 41 the AV is deserted by the RV for the simple past.[2] These figures alone are enough to dispose of any wholesale criticism. In 11 of the 41 Weymouth himself uses the past in his free translation. His criticism therefore touches between a quarter and a third of the passages which come under our notice in Mt. From which we may fairly infer that the Revisers' English was, after all, not quite as black as it was painted. In examining the material, we will assume in the first instance that the aorist is rightly rendered by our perfect (or present) in all the places where AV and RV agree. (This is only assumed for the sake of argument, as will be seen below.) Our first task then is with the 41 passages in which there is a difference. Of these Weymouth's own translation justifies 2^{15} (a very *definite* aor.—see Hos 11^{1}) $5^{31.\ 33.\ 38.\ 43}$ (here AV was misled by its wrong translation of τοῖς ἀρχαίοις—it is right in vv.$^{21.\ 27}$) $10^{34\text{f.}}$ (AV *came* in one of the three) 17^{12} 21^{42} $25^{40\ bis}$. We may further deduct 21^{16} as justified by the AV in v.^{42}, and $25^{24.\ 26}$ as on all fours with the past "I sowed." It remains to discuss the legitimacy of the English past in the rest of the exx. Our test shall be sought in idiomatic sentences, constructed so as to carry the same grammatical conditions: they are purposely assimilated to the colloquial idiom, and are therefore generally made parallel in grammar only to the passages they illustrate. In each case the preterite tacitly implies a definite occasion; and the parallel will show that this implication is at least a natural understanding of the Greek. Where the perfect is equally idiomatic, we may infer that the Greek is indeterminate. Taking them as they come, 2^{2} εἴδομεν seems to me clearly *definite*: "I saw the news in the paper and came off at once." 3^{7} ὑπέδειξεν: "has warned" may be justified, but "Who told you that?" is presumably English. We may put together 5^{17} $10^{34\text{f.}}$ (ἦλθον) 15^{24} (ἀπεστάλην). As we have seen, the AV and Weymouth use the past in one of these passages, and they are all on the same footing. "I came for business, not for pleasure" is good enough English, even if "have come" is likewise correct and not very different. Or compare Shakspere's

---

[1] Including 6[12], where the AV would certainly have translated ἀφήκαμεν as the RV has done. In a private memorial which was sent to the Revisers by an unnamed colleague, before their final revision, it is stated that out of nearly 200 places in the Gospels where the aorist was rendered by the English perfect, the Revisers had only followed the AV in 66. The figures above for Mt show that the appeal took effect; but in Jn 17, which is specially named, the 21 exx. remain in the published text. That the majority were right there, I cannot doubt: the English perfect in that chapter obscures a special feature of the great prayer, the tone of detachment with which the Lord contemplates His earthly life as a period lying in the past.

[2] One passage, 18[11], is only in RVmg.

> "Why came I hither but for that intent?"

In 7^{22} (ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, ἐξεβάλομεν, ἐποιήσαμεν) the perfect would be unobjectionable, but the past is quite idiomatic: cf such a sentence as "Now then—didn't I make speeches all over the country? Didn't I subscribe liberally to the party funds?" 10[8] (ἐλάβετε): cf "What do you expect? You paid nothing: you get nothing." 11[17] (ηὐλίσαμεν, etc.): cf "There's no pleasing you. I made small talk, and you were bored: I gave you a lecture, and you went to sleep." 11[25] (ἀπέκρυψας, ἀπεκάλυψας—see above): cf "I am very glad you kept me in the dark, and told my friend." 13[17] (ἐπεθύμησαν, εἶδον, ἤκουσαν): here no better justification is needed than Watts's

> "How blessed are our ears
>   That hear this joyful sound,
> Which kings and prophets waited for,
>   And sought, but never found."

13[44] (ἔκρυψε): the aorist is almost gnomic, like Jas 1[24], but it would be wrong to obliterate the difference between the aorist and the present (historic) which follows.[1] 15[13] ἐφύτευσεν): cf "Every movement which you didn't start is wrong." 16[7] (ἐλάβομεν): cf "I brought no money away with me." 19[12] (εὐνούχισαν) is to my mind the only decided exception. Unless Origen's exegesis was right, the third verb does not refer to a single event like the other two, except so far as may concern a moment of renunciation in the past: the perfect therefore would perhaps be less misleading, despite apparent inconsistency. 21[20] (ἐξηράνθη): cf "How on earth did that happen?" (AV wrongly joins πῶς and παραχρῆμα.) 21[42] (ἐγενήθη—for ἐγένετο see p. 138) is ambiguous: if it is the aorist of an event just completed, the AV is right, but this may well be pure narrative. 28[15] (διεφημίσθη): here the added words "[and continueth]" leave the verb to be a narrative aorist. Finally 28[20] (ἐνετειλάμην) is obviously idiomatic: cf "Mind you attend to everything I told you." In all these passages then, with one possible exception, the simple past is proved to be entirely idiomatic; and if this is allowed, we may freely concede the perfect as permissible in several cases, and occasionally perhaps preferable.

Let us go back for a moment to our lists for Mt, to draw some inferences as to the meaning of the aorist where simple narrative, and the reference to a specific time, are mostly excluded. Parenthetically, we might strike out a few of the passages in which AV and RV agree on the English perfect. 13^{28} is not indefinite: "*You* did that" is quite as correct as "You have done it," and seems to me more suitable where the emphasis is to lie on the subject. In 19^{6} *συνέζευξεν* carries the thought immediately and obviously to the wedding day: "those whom God *joined* together" is on this view preferable. Similarly *ἀφήκαμεν* (*-κεν*) in $19^{27.\,29}$ calls up unmistakably the day of the sacrifice. In 20^{7} we cannot object to rendering "has hired"; but it may be observed that "nobody asked you" is not exactly a Græcism. And surely *ἥμαρτον παραδούς* (27^{4}) is definite enough—"I sinned when I betrayed"? We may end this section by putting together the exx. of two important categories. Under the head of "things just happened" come 9^{18} *ἐτελεύτησεν* (with *ἄρτι*); 5^{28} *ἐμοίχευσεν* and 14^{15} *παρῆλθεν* and 17^{12} *ἦλθε* (with *ἤδη*); 6^{12} *ἀφήκαμεν*, 12^{28} *ἔφθασεν*, $14^{2\text{ etc.}}$ *ἠγέρθη*, 16^{17} *ἀπεκάλυψε*, 18^{15} *ἐκέρδησας*, 20^{12} *ἐποίησαν -ας*, 26^{10} *ἠργάσατο* 26^{13} *ἐποίησε*, 26^{65} *ἐβλασφήμησεν*, *ἠκούσατε*, $26^{25.\,64}$ *εἶπας*, 27^{19} *ἔπαθον*, 27^{46} *ἐγκατέλιπες*, 28^{7} *εἶπον*, 28^{18} *ἐδόθη* (unless 11^{27} forbids), and perhaps 21^{42} *ἐγενήθη*. Some of these may of course be otherwise explained. If they rightly belong to this heading, the English perfect is the correct rendering. Equally tied to the *have* tense are the aorists of indefinite time-reference; but we must be ready to substitute our preterite as soon as we see reason to believe that the time of occurrence is at all prominently before the writer's mind. Clear examples of this are $5^{21\text{ etc.}}$ *ἠκούσατε*, 8^{10} *εὗρον*, 10^{25} *ἐπεκάλεσαν*, $12^{3\text{ etc}}$ *ἀνέγνωτε* (*οὐδέποτε* in 21^{16} brings in the note of time: cf Shakspere, "Why dost thou wrong her that *did ne'er* wrong thee?), 13^{15} *ἐπαχύνθη* etc., 15^{6} *ἠκυρώσατε*, 13^{24} 18^{23} 22^{2} *ὡμοιώθη* (probably because the working out of the comparison included action partially past: Zahn compares Jn 3^{19}), 21^{16} *κατηρτίσω*, 23^{23} *ἀφήκατε*, 24^{45} *κατέστησεν*, $25^{20.\,22}$ *ἐκέρδησα*, 27^{23} *ἐποίησε*.

---

[1] For this idiom see p. 121 n. above. Wellhausen, on Mk 7[28] (*Einl.* 16), makes it an Aramaism. In view of the MGr usage, we can only accept this with the proviso that it be counted good vernacular Greek as well.

The Perfect:— Our study of the English periphrastic perfect prepares us for taking up the most important, exegetically, of all the Greek Tenses. In Greek, as in

English, the line between aorist and perfect is not always easy to draw. The aorist of the event just passed has inherently that note of close connexion between past and present which is the differentia of the Greek perfect; while the perfect was increasingly used, as the language grew older, as a substitute for what would formerly have been a narrative aorist. A cursory reading of the papyri soon shows us how much more the vernacular tends to use this tense; and the inference might be drawn that the old distinction of aorist and perfect was already obsolete. This would however be entirely unwarrantable. There are extremely few passages in the papyri of the earlier centuries A.D. in which an aoristic perfect is demanded, or even suggested, by the context. It is simply that a preference grows in popular speech for the expression which links the past act with present consequences.[a] A casual example from the prince of Attic writers will show that this is not only a feature of late Greek. Near the beginning of Plato's *Crito*, Socrates explains his reason for believing that he would not die till the third day. "This I infer," he says in Jowett's English, "from a vision which I *had* last night, or rather only just now." The Greek, however, is *τεκμαίρομαι ἔκ τινος ἐνυπνίου, ὃ ἑώρακα ὀλίγον πρότερον ταύτης τῆς νυκτός*, where point of time in the past would have made *εἶδον* as inevitable as the aorist is in English, had not Socrates meant to emphasise the present vividness of the vision. It is for exactly the same reason that *ἐγήγερται* is used with the point of time in 1 Co 15^4 (see above). So long as the close connexion of the past and the present is maintained, there is no difficulty whatever in adding the note of time. So in Rom 16^7 we have to say either "who were in Christ before me," or (much better) "who have been in Christ longer than I." A typical parallel from the papyri may be seen in OP 477 (ii/A.D.) *τῶν τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος . . . ἐφηβευκότων*—a fusion of "who came of age *in*" and "who have been of age *since* the fifth year." Now, if the tendency just described grew beyond a certain limit, the fusion of aorist and perfect would be complete. But it must be observed that it was not the perfect which survived in the struggle for existence. In MGr the old perfect forms only survive in the passive participle (with reduplication syllable

Used in place of Aorist.

---

[a] See pp. 247 f.

Ultimate decay of the Perfect.

Perfect and Aorist used together.

lost), and in the *-κα* which was tacked on to the aorist passive (*ἐδέθηκα* for *ἐδέθην*): there is also the isolated *εὕρηκα* or *βρῆκα* (Thumb, *Handb.* 94), aoristic in meaning. It does not appear that the perfect had at all superseded the aorist—though in a fair way to do so—at the epoch when it was itself attacked by the weakening of reduplication which destroyed all chance of its survival as a distinct form, in competition with the simpler formation of the aorist. But these processes do not fairly set in for at least two centuries after the NT was complete. It is true that the LXX and inscriptions show a few examples of a semi-aoristic perfect in the pre-Roman age, which, as Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus*, p. 153), disposes of the idea that Latin influence was working; cf Jannaris, § 1872. But it is easy to overstate their number.[a] Thus in Ex 32^1 *κεχρόνικε* is not really aoristic (as Thumb and Jannaris), for it would be wholly irregular to put an aorist in *oratio obliqua* to represent the original present or perfect "Moses is tarrying" or "has tarried": its analogue is rather the *χρονίζει* of Mt 24^{48}. Nor will it do to cite the perfects in Heb 11^{17} *al* (see pp. 129, 143 ff.), where the use of this tense to describe what "stands written" in Scripture is a marked feature of the author's style:[b] cf Plato, *Apol.* 28C, *ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασιν*, as written in the Athenians' "Bible." In fact Mt 13^{46} *πέπρακεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν* is the only NT example cited by Jannaris which makes any impression. (I may quote in illustration of this OP 482 (ii/A.D.) *χωρὶς ὧν ἀπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα.*) The distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries. Thus *τῆς γενομένης καὶ ἀποπεπεμμένης γυναικός* NP 19 (ii/A.D.), "who *was* my wife and *is now* divorced"; *ὅλον τὸν χαλκὸν [δεδα]πάνηκα εἰς αὐτῷ* BU 814 (iii/A.D.), where an erased *ἐ-* shows that the scribe meant to write the aorist and then substituted the more appropriate perfect. As may be expected, illiterate documents show confusion most: *e.g.* OP 528 (ii/A.D.) *οὐκ ἐλουσάμην οὐκ ἤλιμε* (= *ἤλειμμαι*) *μέχρει ιβ᾽ Ἀθύρ.* It is in the combinations of aorist and perfect that we naturally look first for the weakening of the distinction, but even there it often appears clearly drawn. At the same time, we may find a writer like Justin

---

[a] [b] See p. 248.

Martyr guilty of confusion, as in *Apol.* i. 22 *πεποιηκέναι . ἀνεγεῖραι*, 32 *ἐκάθισε καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν*, 44 *νοῆσαι δεδύνηνται καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο.* Other aoristic perfects may be seen in 60 *ἐξῆλθον . . . καὶ γεγόνασι*, 62 *ἀκήκοε . . . καὶ . . . ἔλαβε*, ii. 2 *πεποίηκε . . . καὶ . . . ἐκολάσατο*, etc. We may compare from the LXX such a mixture as Is 53[5] *ἐτραυματίσθη . . . μεμαλάκισται* (aor. in A). The NT is not entirely free from such cases: cf Mt 13[46] (above). In Jn 3[32] *ἑώρακεν* and *ἤκουσεν*—contrast 1 Jn 1[3]—is explained by Blass as due to the greater stress laid on the *seeing.* Mk 5[19] *ὅσα . . . σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἠλέησέν σε* shows the proper force of both tenses. In Lk 4[18] it seems best, with Nestle and Wellhausen, to put a stop after *ἔχρισέ με*, so that *ἀπέσταλκε* is the governing verb of all the infinitives, and is not parallel with *ἔχρισε*. Ac 21[28], *εἰσήγαγεν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν*, needs no explaining. To Rev 3[3] 5[7] and 8[5] we must return later. There are other places where aorist and perfect are used in the same context, but they do not belong to this category of aorist and perfect joined with *καί* and with identical subject. When the nexus is so close, we might fairly suppose it possible for the tenses to be contaminated by the association, even where a perfect would not have been used aoristically by itself. But there are evidently no NT exx. to place by the side of those from Justin, except Mt 13[46] and the passages from Rev. (See further p. 238.)

Aoristic Perfects in NT?

We come then to the general question of the existence of aoristic perfects in the NT. It is a question which must be settled on its merits, without any appeal to the *a priori*, for aoristic perfects may certainly be found in and even before the epoch of the NT writings. We are entirely at liberty to recognise such perfects in one writer and deny them to another, or to allow them for certain verbs and negative the class as a whole. Among the authorities we find Blass (p. 200) admitting them for Rev and most sparingly in other places. Even less concession is made by W. F. Moulton (WM 340 n.). Burton (*MT* 44) allows rather more, but says, "The idiom is confined to narrow limits in the NT." The extremely small proportion of even possible exx. will naturally prevent us from accepting any except under very clear necessity. We begin by ruling out the alleged exx. from Heb (7[13] 9[18] 11[17]

11^{28}), since they are obviously covered by the author's *usus loquendi* described above (p. 142). Some isolated cases may also be cleared out of the way. Lk 9^{36} *ἑώρακαν* seems to be virtually reported speech: *ἃ ἑωράκαμεν* takes this form regularly in *orat. obl.*, which the form of this sentence suggests. In Jas 1^{24}, *κατενόησεν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο*, the aorist expresses two momentary acts, which are thrown into narrative form, and the perfect accurately describes the one action with continuance.[1] In Ac 7^{35}, *ἀπέσταλκεν*, with the forest of aorists all round, is more plausibly conformed to them, and it happens that this word is alleged to have aoristic force elsewhere. But, after all, the abiding results of Moses' mission formed a thought never absent from a Jew's mind. Then there is an important category in which we are liable to be misled by an unreal parallelism in English. Burton rightly objects to our deciding the case of *νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα* (2 Co 11^{25}) by the easy comment that it "goes quite naturally into English" (Simcox). But it does not follow that we have here a mere equivalent for *ἐποίησα*. That would only place the experience on a level with the others: this recalls it as a memory specially vivid now. There is in fact a perfect of broken as well as of unbroken continuity: in the graph "$\overset{A}{.}\ldots\rightarrow\ldots\overset{B}{.}$," which leads from a past moment to the moment of speech, the perfect will tolerate the company of adjuncts that fasten attention on the initial point (as in Rom 16^{7}, above) or on some indeterminate point in its course (as here), or on several points in its course. Cf Lucian *Pisc.* 6 *ποῦ γὰρ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ὕβρικα;*—Plato *Theæt.* 144B *ἀκήκοα μὲν τοὔνομα, μνημονεύω δ' οὔ* (see Goodwin *MT* § 46)—BU 163 (ii/A.D.) *φασὶ οἱ παρόντες ἐκεῖνον μᾶλλον* (? "often") *τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι, καὶ γὰρ ἄλλοι ὡς πληγέντες ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναφόριον δεδώκασι*—EP 11 (222 B.C.) *πλεονάκις γεγράφαμεν.* To this category belong perfects with *πώποτε*, as Jn 1^{18} 5^{37} 8^{33}, and such cases as 2 Co 12^{17}, *ὧν ἀπέσταλκα*, "of those whom (from time to time) I have sent." The aorist is obviously much commoner; but the perfect may still be used to express a close nexus with present time.

We turn finally to the residuum of genuinely aoristic perfects, or those which have a fair claim to be thus regarded.

---

[1] Cf *Syll.* 807^{17} (ii/A.D.) *καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ηὐχαρίστησεν δημοσίᾳ* **τῷ θεῷ** (sc. Asclepios).

In Rev.

First, we may frankly yield those alleged for Rev, viz. 5^7 and 8^5 *εἴληφεν* (and by consequence probably 3^3 11^{17} and 2^{27}), 7^{14} and 19^3 *εἴρηκα* (*-αν*). Since these are without apparent reduplication, they may well have been actual aorists in the writer's view: Bousset remarks how little Rev uses *ἔλαβον*.

Ἔσχηκα.

Secondly, we have *ἔσχηκα* in 2 Co 2^{13} 1^9 7^5, Rom 5^2[a]—outside Paul only in Mk 5^{15}. We must, I think, treat all the Pauline passages alike, though Blass believes the perfect justifiable except in 2 Co 2^{13}. It seems clear that an aorist would suit all passages in 2 Co; and in the first of them it seems hopeless to squeeze a natural perfect force into the Greek:[1] an aorist would suit Mk *l.c.* perfectly, but that matters less. Now, if we may take them together, we can see an excellent reason why *ἔσχηκα* should have been used as an aorist. There is no Greek for *possessed*, the constative aorist, since *ἔσχον* is almost (if not quite) exclusively used for the ingressive *got, received.*[b] *Ἔσχον* occurs only 20 times in the NT, which is about 3 per cent. of the whole record of *ἔχω*. There is not one place where *ἔσχον must* be constative: Jn 4^{18} may be rendered "thou hast espoused"—as in Mk 12^{23}, the forming of the tie is the point. The NT does not contravene Dr Adam's dictum (p. 49 of his notes on Plato's *Apology*) that "the aorist means *got, acquired*, not *had.*" The similarity of *ἔσχηκα* to the aorists *ἔθηκα* and *ἀφῆκα* gave a clear opening for its appropriation to this purpose, and the translation "possessed" will generally suit the case. We thus get in the required aoristic perfects in Rev and in Paul without sacrificing a principle.

Πέπρακα.
Γέγονα.

Passing over *πέπρακα* (Mt 13^{46}), where the absence of an aorist from the same root may have something to do with the usage, we come to the perplexing case of *γέγονα*. Its affinities would naturally be with the present, and there seems small reason for letting it do the work of the common *ἐγενόμην*. Yet even Josephus

---

[1] Plummer (*CGT in loc.*) says, "As in 1^9, the perfect shows how vividly he recalls the feelings of that trying time": so Findlay. This means applying what is said above on *πεποίηκα* in 2 Co 11^{25}. But is this natural, when the coming of Titus with good news had produced *ἄνεσις* so complete? (See p. 238.)

[a] [b] See p. 248.

(*c. Apion.* i. 21) has *ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τῆς Πεισιστράτου τυραννίδος ἀνθρώπου γεγονότος*, "who flourished a little before P." From the papyri we may cite two exx. (both from ii/A.D.). OP 478, "I declare that my son . . . has reached (*προσβεβηκέναι*) the age of 13 in the past 16th year of Hadrian . . . and that his father *was* (*γεγονέναι*) an inhabitant . . . and is now dead (*τετελευτηκέναι*)." BU 136 *διαβεβαιουμένου τοῦ Π. μὴ γεγονέναι τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἐκδικουμένης ὀνηλάτην.* Now there are not a few NT passages in which it is far from easy to trace the distinct perfect force of *γέγονα*, and exx. like those above make it seem useless to try. But aoristic sense is not really *proved* for any of the 45 NT passages in which *γέγονα* (indic.) occurs, and in the great majority it has obviously present time. Lk 10^{36} and Jn 6^{25} are unpromising for our thesis. But the first has the vivid present of story-telling—"seems to have shown himself neighbour." The second—inevitably translated "when *camest* thou hither?"—is only another instance of the perfect with point of time, dealt with already: it is the combination of "when *did* you come?" and "how long *have* you been here?" The aoristic use of *γέγονα* is said by Burton to be general in Mt: Blass only admits it in 25^6. Even this last is more like a historic present. The remaining passages mostly belong to the formula which tells us that the abiding significance of an event lies in its having been anticipated in prophecy. In general, it would appear that we can only admit a case of the kind with the utmost caution. K. Buresch, in his valuable article "*Γέγοναν*" (*RhM* 1891, pp. 193 ff.), noting an example of aoristic *γεγόνασι* in Plato (?) *Alcib.* 124A,[1] observes that this is never found in Greek that is at all respectable. In later Greek, he proceeds, the use of *γέγονα* greatly increases. "It has present force always where it denotes a state of rest, preterite force where it denotes becoming. Hence in innumerable cases it is quite an equivalent of *εἰμί*, as with *exstiti*, *factus* or *natus sum*, *veni*, etc." (p. 231 n.). It may be doubted however whether this canon will adequately account for the exx. from Josephus and the papyri with which we began.[2]

Since the earliest period of Greek, certain perfects pos-

---

[1] But see p. 238. [2] Note *γέγονα* there is *constative*: *ἐγενόμην* is mostly *ingressive.*

Perfects with Present Force.

sessed a present meaning, depending upon the mode of action belonging to the root, and on that exhibited in the present. Thus the markedly conative present *πείθω*, "apply persuasion," with its new perfect *πέπεικα* and aorist *ἔπεισα* to match, kept its ancient perfect *πέποιθα*, which is intransitive (like most early perfects—see below, p. 154), with meaning *I trust.* Monro's account of the Perfect in its Homeric stage of development may be quoted: "If we compare the meaning of any Perfect with that of the corresponding Aorist or Present, we shall usually find that the Perfect denotes a permanent *state*, the Aor. or Pres. an *action* which brings about or constitutes that state. Thus, . . . *ὤλετο was lost*, *ὄλωλε is undone*. . . . Thus the so-called *Perfecta præsentia*, . . . *ἕστηκα*, . . . *μέμνημαι*, *πέποιθα*, *οἶδα*, *ἔοικα*, *κέκτημαι*, etc., are merely the commonest instances of the rule. . . . Verbs expressing sustained sounds . . . are usually in the Perfect" (*HG* 31). This last remark explains *κέκραγα*, which has survived in Hellenistic, as the LXX seems to show decisively. W. F. Moulton (WM 342 n.) says, "In Jn 1[15] *hath cried* seems the more probable meaning," observing that the pres. *κράζω* is rare in classical writers. It is common in NT, a fact which probably weighed with him in making *κέκραγεν* a normal perfect. But the LXX, when exx. are so numerous and well distributed, must certainly count as evidence for the vernacular here; and when we find *κέκραγα* 14 times, sometimes indisputably present, and never I think even probably perfect—cf esp. Ps 141(140)[1] *πρὸς σὲ ἐκέκραξα . . . πρόσχες τῇ φωνῇ τῆς δεήσεώς μου ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με πρὸς σέ* (Heb. בְּקָרְאִי); and Job 30[20], where *κέκραγα* translates the impf. אֲשַׁוַּע ——, it is difficult to suppose the word used as a true perfect in NT. It has not however been "borrowed from the literary language in place of the Hellenistic *κράζει*" (Blass 198). *Κράζω* has its own distinction as a durative —cf Ps 32(31)[3] *ἀπὸ τοῦ κράζειν με ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν*; and *κέκραγα*, with *κεκράξομαι* and *ἐκέκραξα*, may well have been differentiated as expressing a single cry. In any case we cannot treat the LXX as evidence for the literary character of the survival. One may doubt the necessity of putting *ἤλπικα* and *πέπεισμαι* into this category; but *τέθνηκα* naturally belongs to it; and ἥγημαι in Ac 26[2] (contr. Phil 3[7]) is one of the literary touches characteristic of the speech before Agrippa: see Blass *in loc.* (See further p. 238.)

The Pluperfect. The Pluperfect, which throws the Perfect into past time, was never very robust in Greek. It must not be regarded as a mere convenience for expressing relative time, like the corresponding tense in English. The conception of relative time never troubled the Greeks; and the aorist, which simply states that the event happened, is generally quite enough to describe what we like to define more exactly as preceding the time of the main verb. A typical case of a pluperfect easily misunderstood is Lk 8[29], which we referred to on p. 75 in connexion with the concurrent ambiguity of πολλοῖς χρόνοις, and again (p. 113) in connexion with the perfectivising force of σύν. Since vernacular usage so clearly warrants our rendering the former "for a long time," we are free to observe that to render "oftentimes it had seized him" (RV text) involves a decided abnormality. It would have to be classed as the past of the "perfect of broken continuity" which we discussed above (p. 144) on 2 Co 11[25]. But it must be admitted that the extension of this to the pluperfect is complex, and if there is a simple alternative we should take it; RVmg is essentially right, though "held fast" would be better than "seized." We need not examine further the use of this tense, which may be interpreted easily from what has been said of Perfect action. It should be noted that it appears sometimes in conditional sentences where an aorist would have been possible: *e.g.* 1 Jn 2[19] μεμενήκεισαν ἄν. The pluperfect expresses the continuance of the contingent result to the time of speaking. In Mt 12[7] ἐγνώκειτε is virtually an imperfect to a present ἔγνωκα, in which the perfect form has the same rationale as in οἶδα; and in Jn 19[11] ἐδόθη[1] would have only pictured the original gift and not the presence of it with Pilate at the moment.

The Future:— Its Action. Last comes the Future. The nature of its action may be looked at first. This may be examined in the history of its form. Its close connexion with the sigmatic aorist act. and mid., and the two aorists pass., is obvious. Except in the passive, in fact, the future was mainly a specialised form of the aorist subjunctive.[1] As such it will naturally share the point action of the aorist. We cannot however decisively rule out the possibility that another formation may have contributed to the Greek future, a formation which would be originally linear in action. The Aryan (Indo-Iranian) and Letto-Slavonic branches of the Indo-Germanic family have a future in *-syō*, which however was very moderately developed in these contiguous groups before they separated. Greek, geographically contiguous with Aryan on the other side in prehistoric times, may have possessed this future; but the existing Greek future can be very well explained without it, though it might be safest to allow its probable presence. In any case there is no question that the action of the Future is in usage mixed. *Ἄξω* is either "I shall lead" or "I shall bring"—the former durative, the latter effective. Thus in Mk 14^{28} *προάξω ὑμᾶς* is probably "I shall go before you," while *ἄξων* (Ac 22^{5}) "to bring," and *ἄξει* (1 Th 4^{14}) "he will bring," refer to the end of the action and not its progress. An ingressive future may probably be seen in *ὑποταγήσεται*, 1 Co 15^{28}: the *τότε* seems to show that the Parousia is thought of as initiating a new kind of subordination of the Son to the Father, and not the perpetuation of that which had been conspicuous in the whole of the mediatorial æon. The exposition of this mystery must be taken up by the theologians. We pass on to note another example of the ingressive future, to be found in Jn 8^{32}. *Ἐλευθεροῦν* appears to be always punctiliar in NT, but it is not necessarily so: cf Sophocles *OT* 706 *τό γ' εἰς ἑαυτὸν πᾶν ἐλευθεροῖ στόμα*, "as for himself, he *keeps* his lips wholly pure" (Jebb). (It is true Sir R. Jebb uses "*set* free" in his note, but the durative force of his translation seems more suitable.) It is therefore noteworthy that in v.^{33} we have the paraphrase *ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε*, to bring out the (ingressive) point action of the future that precedes. Sometimes the possession of two future forms enabled the language to differentiate these meanings. Thus *ἕξω* was associated

---

[1] On the periphrastic pluperfect, ἦν δεδομένον, see pp. 225 ff.

---

[1] See Giles, *Manual*^{2} 446–8.

Shall and *Will.*

with ἔχω, and meant "I shall possess"; σχήσω with ἔσχον, and so meant "I shall get."[1] There is one possible ex. in NT: in 1 Pet 4^{18} φανεῖται may well be durative as in Attic—note the durative σῴζεται preceding it in the same clause; while φανήσεται (Mt 24^{30}) has obviously point action. See the classical evidence marshalled in Kühner-Gerth i. 114 ff., 170 ff.: add the note in Giles, *Manual*^{2} 483 n. Since Hellenistic generally got rid of alternative forms—even σχήσω is entirely obsolete,[2]—this distinction will not be expected to play any real part in NT Greek. Indeed even those futures which by their formation were most intimately connected with the aorist, such as φοβηθήσομαι (for which Attic could use a durative φοβήσομαι), exercised the double mode of action which was attached to the tense as a whole: cf Heb 13^6, where "be afraid" (durative) seems to be the meaning, rather than "become afraid." This question settled, we next have to decide between *shall* and *will* as the appropriate translation. The volitive future involves action depending on the will of the speaker or of the subject of the verb: in *I will go, you shall go*, it is the former; in *will you go?* it is the latter. Side by side with this there is the purely futuristic *we shall go, they will go.* It is impossible to lay down rules for the rendering of the Greek future—the case is almost as complicated as are the rules for the use of *shall* and *will* in standard English. Not only are the volitive and the futuristic often hard to distinguish, but we have to reckon with an archaic use of the auxiliaries which is traditional in Bible translation. For instance, in such a passage as Mk 13^{24-27} we have *shall* seven times where in modern English we should undeniably use *will.*[3] But in v.^{13} ("the same *shall* be saved") the substitution of *will* is not at all certain, for the words may be read as a promise (a volitive use), in which *shall* is correct. Speaking generally, it may fairly be claimed that unless volitive force is distinctly traceable from the context, it would be better to translate by the futuristic form. The modernising of our English NT in this respect would involve the sacrifice of a very large number of *shalls* in the 3rd person, for our idiom has changed in many dependent clauses, in which neither *shall* nor *will* is any longer correct. In Mk 14^{14}, for example, we should certainly say, "Follow him, and wherever he *goes* in. . . ." It is one of the points in which modernising is possible without sacrificing dignity —a sacrifice too palpable in some of the attempts to render the NT into twentieth century English.

---

[1] See Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gramm.* 568, for this as seen in καλῶς σχήσει and καλῶς ἕξει: also his *Gr. Gram.*^{3} 480.

[2] It occurs in *OGIS* 751 (ii/B.C.) ἀσθενῶς [σχή]σετε—see note—and in the archaising Lp P 41 (iv/A.D.) παρ[ασχ]ήσεσθαι: both are only *ex suppl.*

[3] The use of *shall* when prophecy is dealing with future time is often particularly unfortunate. I have heard of an intelligent child who struggled under perplexity for years because of the words "Thou *shalt* deny me thrice": it could not therefore be Peter's fault, if Jesus commanded him! The child's

Moods of the Future.

What remains to be said about the Future will most appropriately come in when we discuss categories such as Commands and Prohibitions, Conditional Sentences, etc. It will suffice to remark here that the moods of the Future have in Hellenistic Greek receded mostly into their original non-existence, as experiments that proved failures. The imperative and subjunctive never existed: a few *lapsus calami* like καυθήσωμαι, or analogically formed aorist subjunctives like ὄψησθε, δώσῃ (WH *App*^{2} 179), will not be counted as efforts to supply the gap. The optative, which only performed the function of *orat. obl.* substitute for fut. indic., has disappeared entirely. The infinitive, originally limited in the same way, except for the construction with μέλλω,[1] has shrunk very considerably, though not obsolete. With μέλλω it is only found in the word ἔσεσθαι. The innumerable confusions in the papyri, where a future form often is a mere blunder for an aorist, show that the tense was already moribund for most practical purposes: see Hatzidakis 190 ff. Finally the participle, the only modal form which may claim prehistoric antiquity, retains a limited though genuine function of its own. The volitive force (here final or quasi-final) is the commonest, as Brugmann remarks,[2] and the papyri keep up the classical use; but futuristic forms are not wanting—cf 1 Co 15^{37}, Heb 3^5, Ac 20^{22}.

---

determinism is probably more widely shared than we think; and a modernised version of many passages like Mk 14^{30}—*e.g.* "you will be renouncing me three times"—would relieve not a few half-conscious difficulties.

[1] Goodwin *MT* § 75.

[2] *Gr. Gram.*^{3} 496.

CHAPTER VII.

THE VERB: VOICE.

Voice:— THE phenomena of Voice in Greek present us with conditions which are not very easy for the modern mind to grasp. Active we know, and Passive we know, nor can we easily conceive a language in which either is absent. But nothing is more certain than that the parent language of our family possessed no Passive, but only Active and Middle, the latter originally equal with the former in prominence, though unrepresented now in any language save by forms which have lost all distinction of meaning. **History of the Middle.** What the prehistoric distinction was, we can only guess. It is suggestive that in the primitive type which is seen in the Greek τίθημι—τίθεμαι, the principle of vowel-gradation (*Ablaut*) will account for -θε- as a weakening of -θη-, and -μι as a weakening of -μαι, if we posit an accent on the root in one form and on the person-ending in the other. Such an assumption obviously does not help with τίθεμεν—τιθέμεθα, nor with λύω—λύομαι; but if it accounts for part of the variation, we have enough to suggest a tentative interpretation of the facts. If such be the origin of the two forms, we might assume a difference of emphasis as the starting-point: in the active the action was stressed, in the middle the agent. We may illustrate this by the different emphasis we hear in the reading of the sentence in the Anglican liturgy which reminds the penitent of the Divine forgiveness. One reader says "*He* pardoneth," wishing to lay all stress on the one Source of pardon, another "He *pardoneth*," the pardon itself being the uppermost thought with him. We could easily suppose the former represented by ἀφίεται and the latter by ἀφίησι in a language in which stress accent is free to alter the weight of syllables as it shifts from one to another.[1]

---

[1] See below, p. 238.

The Middle in Sanskrit,

Out of these postulated conditions, which are of course the merest conjecture, we could readily derive the *nuance* which meets us in the earliest accessible developments of Indo-Germanic speech. The Indian grammarians acutely named the active *parasmai-pada* and the middle *ātmane-pada*, "a word for another" and "for oneself" respectively. Thus *yájate* would be "he sacrifices for himself," while *yájati*, unless the dat. *ātmane* is present in the context, is "he sacrifices for another." The essence of the middle therefore lies in its calling attention to the agent as in some way closely concerned with the action.

and in Latin.

The same characteristic is ultimately found in other languages. In Latin the middle has been somewhat obscured formally by the entrance of the *r* suffix, which it shares with its most intimate relative, the Keltic branch. But this has not caused any confusion with the active; so that the Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit middle voice may be put together, the differentia of Latin being that it has made no reserve like the Greek aorist and future middle, in lending its middle forms to the invading passive.

"Deponents."

In our inquiry into the meaning conveyed by the middle, we naturally start with the verbs which are found in active only or middle only, to both of which classes the unsatisfactory name "deponent" should be given, if retained for either. Typical words not used in the middle, in the parent language, are the originals of our verbs *eat*, *come*, *am*, and the Greek δίδωμι (simplex) and ῥέω; while no active can be traced for νέομαι, ἕπομαι (= *sequor*), μαίνομαι, μητίομαι (= *mētior*), κάθημαι, κεῖμαι.[1] The former class will be seen to denote "an action, an occurrence, or a state"; as likewise do the latter, but "prevailingly such as take place in the sphere of their subject, the whole subject being concerned in the action." Where the distinction is so fine, it is easily seen that many cases must arise in which we can no longer detect it, and are in danger of over-refining if we try. Our investigation must take account of the rather extensive categories in which one part of the verb affects the middle and another the active form. We

---

[1] I quote from Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gramm.* § 799, and mainly follow his account throughout this paragraph.

Intransitive Strong Perfects.

have a number of cases in which the "strong" perfect active attaches itself in meaning to the middle, either figuring among the parts of a verb which has no other active forms, or siding with the intransitive middle where the rest of the active is transitive. So conspicuous is this, that the grammars in which we learnt Greek thirty years ago actually gave "*τέτυπα*"—the product, by the way, of an inventive imagination—as the perfect middle of that highly irregular and defective verb which in those days was our model regular.[1] As exx. of this attachment we may cite *γέγονα* from *γίνομαι* and *ἐλήλυθα* from *ἔρχομαι*,[2] with *ἀνέῳγα*, *ἑστάναι*, *ἀπόλωλα*, *σέσηπα*, and *πέποιθα* as intransitive perfects from transitive verbs. Among the few remaining strong perfects occurring in the NT, we note *ἀκήκοα*, *κέκραγα*,[3] *πέπονθα*, *τέτ(ε)υχα*, and *εἴληφα*, as from verbs with a future middle. We have the defectives *οἶδα*, *ἔοικα*, and *εἴωθα*; and the two isolated actives *ἐνήνοχα* and *γέγραφα* remain the only real exceptions to the rule which finds some link with the middle in each of the relatively few survivors of the primitive perfect active. The list might perhaps be slightly extended from other vernacular Greek: thus *ἀγήοχα* (*ἀγείοχα*, *ἀγέωχα*) is found freely in papyri, and belongs to a purely active verb. The conjecture that the perfect originally had no distinction of active and middle, its person-endings being peculiar throughout, affords the most probable explanation of the facts: when the much later *-κα* perfect arose, the distinction had become universal.

Future Middle in Active sense.

Parallel with this peculiarity, but much more extensive, is the category of middle futures attached to active verbs. As an abnormality for which no reason could be detected, it naturally began to suffer from levelling in Hellenistic, but is still prominent. We have in NT *ἀκούσω* as well as *ἀκούσομαι*, *κράξω* beside *κεκράξομαι*, *γελάσω*, *ἐμπτύσω*, *ἀπαντήσω*, *διώξω*, *ῥεύσω*, *σπουδάσω*,

---

[1] In this the grammars followed ancient authority: thus Dionysius Thrax says, "*μεσότης δὲ ἡ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτὲ δὲ πάθος παριστῶσα, οἷον πέποιθα, διέφθορα, ἐποιησάμην, ἐγραψάμην.*"

[2] The aorist *ἦλθον* is really due to the influence of a third constituent root in this defective verb.

[3] *Κεκράξομαι* is only formally passive.

χωρήσω, ἐμπαίξω, ἁρπάσω, κλέψω, ἁμαρτήσω—all these from the selected list of such verbs in Rutherford's small grammar of Attic Greek, which supplies only about as many exx. of the preservation of the old future middle. (Some of these active futures, indeed, have warrant in classical Greek of other dialects than Attic, even from the Homeric period; but the list will sufficiently illustrate the weakening of this anomaly.) In spite of this, we still find in NT *ὄψομαι, -βήσομαι, γνώσομαι, φάγομαι, ἀποθανοῦμαι, κομίσομαι* and *κομιοῦμαι, λήμψομαι, πίομαι, πεσοῦμαι, τέξομαι, φεύξομαι*, which are enough to show that the phenomenon was anything but obsolete. Rutherford classes most of them as "verbs which denote the exercise of the bodily functions" or "intellectual or emotional activity"; and he would suggest that "the notion of *willing* implied in the future tense" may be the reason of the peculiarity. Brugmann connects it with the tendency of the strong aorist to be intransitive. This would naturally prompt the transitive use of the sigmatic aorist and consequently the future, so that the middle future attaches itself to the active intransitive forms. The explanation is only invoked for cases like *βήσομαι*, and does not exclude Rutherford's suggestion. We may fairly take the existence of this large class of futures as additional evidence of a close connexion between the middle flexion and the stressing of the agent's interest in the action of the verb.

Use of the Middle: how far is it reflexive?

What has been said of the history of the Middle prepares us for the statement that this voice is quite inaccurately described by empiric grammarians as essentially reflexive. As a matter of fact, the proportion of strictly reflexive middles is exceedingly small. In NT we may cite *ἀπήγξατο* (Mt 27^{5}) as the clearest example, and a survival from classical Greek. But even here one may question whether the English intransitive *choke* is not a truer parallel than the reflexive *hang oneself*. It is curious that in Winer's scanty list of exx. (WM 316), presumably selected as the most plausible, we have to discount all the rest. *Λούομαι* accompanies its correlate *νίπτομαι*; and its one decisively middle form (*ὗς λουσαμένη*, 2 Pet 2^{22}) would raise difficulties if it occurred in a better Hellenist. Certainly, if the pig's ablutions are really reflexive rather than passive, sundry current notions need revising. To our author at any rate *λουσαμένη* did not suggest willing co-operation.[1] In citing *κρύπτομαι* (Jn 8^{59}), *bonus dormitat Homerus*: *ἐκρύβη* is not middle in form, nor does the verb show any distinct middle in NT. In *παρασκευάσεται* (1 Co 14^{8}) the intransitive *prepare, make preparations,* gives a better sense than the reflexive. We might bring in such an example as *μὴ σκύλλου* Lk 7^{6}, compared with the illiterate contemporary papyrus OP 295, *μὴ σκλύλλε ἑατήν.* But though no doubt a reflexive meaning ultimately accrued to the Middle, and in MGr almost drives other uses off the field, it would be wrong to suppose that it was originally there. If the active is transitive, the middle indicates that the action goes no further than the agent himself, a sense which naturally comes out of the concentration on the agent characteristic of the middle. Thus *νίπτομαι* is "I wash," with or without object, but implying that the action stops with myself. If then there is no object, *νίπτομαι* = "I wash myself": if there is, *νίπτομαι τὰς χεῖρας* = "I wash *my* hands." This characteristic produced a passive use of the middle, in Brugmann's opinion, before the dialectic differentiation of Indo-Germanic speech. Intransitive use is a natural development from the fundamental idea of the middle; and from intransitive to passive is but a step. The well-known classical use of *ἀποθνήσκει ὑπό τινος*, as correlative to *ἀποκτείνει τις*, illustrates the development. It may seem to us strange that the same form should be used indifferently as active or passive in meaning—that, for example, *ἐνεργουμένη* in Jas 5^{16} should be translated "working" (RV) or "inwrought,"[2] with only the context to decide. Our own coincident transitive and intransitive,

Bearing of the Passive upon Theory of Middle.

---

[1] The rhythmical conclusion of the proverb suggests that it originated in an iambic line from comedy. Was 2 Pet citing from memory a verse the metrical nature of which he did not realise? If so, the original would of course not admit *λουσαμένη*—it would run *λελουμένη δ' ὗς εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου*, or *λουθεῖσ' ἅπαξ ὗς*, or the like. But see below, p. 238, and J. B. Mayor, *Comm.* p. lxii.

[2] See Mayor *in loc.*, and J. A. Robinson, *Eph.* 247. W. F. Moulton strongly favoured the second rendering. Why the Revisers did not give it even a marginal place, is hard to divine: it was there in their first revision.

however, is almost equally capable of producing ambiguity, or would be if it were not for the studied avoidance of ambiguity which is necessarily characteristic of an analytic language. "He who hides can find," "He who hides is safe," exhibit the same form both as transitive and intransitive; and it would be easy to devise a context in which the second would become really ambiguous.

The Middle paraphrased by Reflexive in Dative case.

Typical Middles:—

Reciprocal,

From what has been said, it is clear that the most practical equivalent of the Middle will generally be the active with the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun. This is in fact the nearest approach to a general statement which we can formulate, premising of course that it is rough in itself, and an exaggeration of the differentia. In *προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς* (Lk 12^{1}), "pay attention for yourselves," we have a phrase differing little from *φυλάσσεσθε* (v.^{15}), "be on your guard," being only rather more emphatic. Mk 14^{47} *σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν* is paraphrased by Mt (26^{51}) *ἀπέσπασεν τ. μ. αὐτοῦ*: here, as in Ac 14^{14}, where *διαρρήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῶν* replaces the more idiomatic *διαρρηξάμενοι τὰ ἱ.*, we see the possessive gen. expressing the same shade of meaning. Sometimes we find redundance, as when in Jn 19^{24} *διεμερίσαντο . . . ἑαυτοῖς* stands against the unaccompanied verb in the same quotation Mt 27^{35}. A few typical illustrations of the general principle may be added. *Προσκαλοῦμαι*, "I call to myself," is clear: its opposite *ἀπωθοῦμαι*, "I thrust away from myself," is not really different, since *ἀπωθῶ ἐμαυτῷ* would show a legitimate *dativus commodi*. We have in fact to vary the exact relation of the reflexive perpetually if we are to represent the middle in the form appropriate to the particular example. *Συνεβουλεύσαντο* Mt 26^{4} answers to *συνεβούλευσαν ἑαυτοῖς*, "they counselled one another": here we have the *reciprocal* middle, as in *μάχεσθαι*.[1] *Ἐξελέγοντο* Lk 14^{7} "they picked out for themselves," and so "chose": cf the distinction

---

[1] Cf the closeness of ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτούς. Brugmann has some notes on this middle in *Indog. Forsch.* v. 114. Cf MGr νὰ παρηγορηθοῦμε, "that we may comfort one another" (Abbott 228, distich 56).

Dynamic,

Mental Action.

of *αἱρῶ* and *αἱροῦμαι*. *Πείθειν* is "to exercise suasion": in the middle it keeps the action within the sphere of the agent, and consequently means "to admit suasion to oneself." *Χρῶμαι*, from the old noun *χρή* "necessity," is "I make for myself what is necessary with something"—hence the instrumental, as with the similar middle *utor* in Latin. Less easy to define are the cases of "*dynamic*" middle, where the middle endings only emphasised the part taken by the subject in the action of the verb, thus *νήχω* and *νήχομαι* (not NT) "to swim." The category will include a number of verbs in which it is useless to exercise our ingenuity on interpreting the middle, for the development never progressed beyond the rudimentary stage. We need not stay to detail here the cases where the middle introduces a wholly new meaning. On the point of principle, it should however be noted that mental as opposed to physical applications of the idea of the verb will often be introduced in this way, since mental action is especially confined within the sphere of the agent. Thus *καταλαμβάνω* "seize, overtake" (Jn 1^{5} 12^{35}), in the middle denotes mental "comprehending," as Ac 4^{13}.

Hellenistic Use of the Middle.

"On the whole the conclusion arrived at must be that the NT writers were perfectly capable of preserving the distinction between the active and middle." Such is the authoritative summary of Blass (p. 186), which makes it superfluous for us to labour any proof. Differences between Attic and Hellenistic use in details are naturally found, and the unclassical substitutions of active for middle or middle for active are so numerous as to serve the Abbé Viteau for proof of Hebraism on a large scale. As Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus* 127), a mere glance into Hatzidakis's *Einleitung*—an indispensable classic, the absence of which from Viteau's list of works consulted accounts for a great deal—would have shown him that in the Hellenistic period Greeks by birth were guilty of many innovations in the use of the voices which could never have owed anything to Hebrew. The NT exx. which Hatzidakis gives (pp. 195 ff.) are not at all inconsistent with the dictum of Blass quoted above. The sphere of the middle was, as we have seen, not at all sharply delimited, and usage inevitably varied in different localities and authors. There are plenty of middles in Attic, and even in Homer, in which the rationale of the voice is very hard to define. Naturally such words may have dropped a no longer intelligible distinction, just as popular Latin did in such words as *sequor* and *utor*, while in other words the distinction may have been applied in a different manner. We can see why *γαμεῖσθαι* = *nubere* fell out of use in Hellenistic:[1] even if a need was still felt for a separate word to suit the bride's part in a wedding, the appropriateness of the middle voice was not clear, and the distinction was liable to lapse. The accuracy with which the middle was used would naturally vary with the writers' Greek culture. Note for example how Mt and Lk correct the *ἐφυλαξάμην* (*legem observare*) of their source in Mk 10^{20}. In Mk 2^{23} they have removed another incorrect use, unless *ὁδοποιεῖν* is to be read there with B etc. (WHmg); for *ὁδὸν ποιεῖν* means "construct a road" (Gildersleeve *Synt.* 69), and the middle should have been used instead. In the less educated papyrographers we find blunders of this kind considerably earlier than the time when the more subtle meanings of the middle disappeared.[a] As early as 95 B.C. we find *ἐὰν αἱρῆτε* and *ἐὰν αἱρῆσθε* used side by side for "if you like" (GH 36), and in the preceding century *διαλύωμεν* appears in the sense of *διαλυώμεθα* in LP*e*. These are of course sporadic, but some violations of classical usage have almost become fixed. This especially applies to the idiomatic use of *ποιεῖσθαι* with a noun as substitute for a verb. Here the middle sense was not clearly discernible to the plain man, and *ποιεῖν* invades the province of the middle very largely. We still have *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι* (as in Eph 1^{16}) BU 632 (ii/A.D.), *καταφυγὴν ποιεῖσθαι* TP 5 (ii/i B.C.), BU 970 (ii/A.D.), etc. But the recurrent phrase *τὸ προσκύνημά* (*σου*) *ποιῶ* only twice (Letr. 117, Tb P 412) has the middle. Mt 6^{2} *π. ἐλεημοσύνην*, Mk 15^{1} *συμβούλιον π.*,[2] Lk 18^{7} *π. ἐκδίκησιν*, etc., will serve as specimens of a fairly large class of usages, in which we cannot accuse the writers of ignorance, since the middle could only defend itself by prescription. So when a new phrase was developed, there might be hesitation between the voices: *συνᾶραι λόγον* appears in Mt 18^{23} 25^{19}, BU 775 (ii/A.D.), but the middle, as in FP 109 (i/A.D.), OP 113 (ii/A.D.), is more classical in spirit. In places however where an educated Hellenist like Paul markedly diverges from the normal, we need not hesitate on occasion to regard his variation as purposed: thus *ἡρμοσάμην* 2 Co 11^{2} fairly justifies itself by the profound *personal* interest the apostle took in this spiritual *προμνηστική*.

---

[1] Speaking generally: it survives in the legal language of marriage contracts, as OP 496 (early ii/A.D.), and even Lp P 41 (iv/A.D.). [[a] See p. 248.

[2] Cf the modern phrase *συμβούλιο γιὰ νὰ κάμουν* "to consult," of physicians (Abbott 200). (On *ποιεῖν* in such phrases, cf Robinson, *Eph.* 172.)

Αἰτῶ and Αἰτοῦμαι.

This is not the place for discussing, or even cataloguing, all the verbs which vary from classical norm in respect of the middle voice; but there is one special case on which we must tarry a little longer. The distinction between *αἰτῶ* and *αἰτοῦμαι* claims attention because of the juxtaposition of the two in Jas $4^{2f.}$, 1 Jn 5^{15}, Mk 6^{22-25} $10^{35.\ 38}$ (= Mt $20^{20.\ 22}$). The grammarian Ammonius (iv/A.D.) declares that *αἰτῶ* means to ask *simpliciter*, with no thought of returning, while *αἰτοῦμαι* involves only request for a loan. This remark serves as an example of the indifferent success of late writers in their efforts to trace an extinct subtlety. Blass (p. 186) says that *αἰτοῦμαι* was used in business transactions, *αἰτῶ* in requests of a son from a father, a man from God, and others on the same lines. He calls the interchange in Jas and 1 Jn *ll.cc.* "arbitrary"; but it is not easy to understand how a writer like James could commit so purposeless a freak as this would be. Mayor in his note cites grammarians who made *αἰτοῦμαι* = *ask μεθ' ἱκεσίας*, or *μετὰ παρακλήσεως*, which certainly suits the idea of the middle better than Ammonius' unlucky guess. "When *αἰτεῖτε* is thus opposed to *αἰτεῖσθε*," Mayor proceeds, "it implies using the words, without the spirit, of prayer." If the middle is really the stronger word, we can understand its being brought in just where an effect of contrast can be secured, while in ordinary passages the active would carry as much weight as was needed. For the alternation of active and middle in the Herodias story, Blass's ingenious remark may be recalled, that "the daughter of Herodias, after the king's declaration, stands in a kind of business relation to him" (p. 186 n.), so that the differentia of the middle cited above will hold.

Middle and Passive Aorists.

The line of demarcation between Middle and Passive is generally drawn by the help of the passive aorist, which is supposed to be a sound criterion in verbs the voice of which is doubtful. It should however be pointed out that historically this criterion has little or no value. The "strong" aorist passive in *-ην* is nothing but a special active formation, as its endings show, which became passive by virtue of its preference for intransitive force. The *-θην* aorist was originally developed, according to Wackernagel's practically certain conjecture, out of the old aorist middle, which in non-thematic formations ran like ἐδόμην—ἐδόθης—ἔδοτο: when the thematic *-σο* displaced the older *-θης* (Skt. *-thās*), the form ἐδόθης was set free to form a new tense on the analogy of the *-ην* aorist, which was no more necessarily passive than the identic formation seen in Latin *habēs, habet.* Compare ἐχάρην from χαίρω (later also χαίρομαι, by formal levelling),[1] where the passive idea remained imperceptible even in NT times: the formally passive ἐκρύβη, from κρύπτω, in Jn 8^{59} (cf Gen 3^{10}) will serve as an ex. of a pure intransitive aorist from a transitive verb.[2] In Homer (cf Monro *HG* 45) the *-θην* aorist is very often indistinguishable in use from the aorist middle; and it is unsafe to suppose that in later periods of the language the presence of an aorist in *-θην* or *-ην* is proof of a passive meaning in a "deponent" verb. Of course the *-θην* forms, with their derivative future, were in the very large majority of cases passive; but it may be questioned whether there was markedly more passivity in the "feel" of them than there was in the present or perfect formations. For example, from ἀποκρίνομαι, "answer," we have ἀπεκρινάμην in Attic Greek and predominantly in the papyri, while ἀπεκρίθην greatly outnumbers it in the NT; but the evidence noted above (p. 39) shows that the two forms were used concurrently in the *Κοινή*, and without the slightest difference of sense. W. F. Moulton was inclined to see "a faint passive force . . . in most of the instances" of *ἐστάθην* in NT, though observing that it "is in regular use as an intransitive aorist" in MGr[1] (WM 315 n.). He also suggested the possibility that *ἐκοιμήθην* in 1 Th 4^{14} might be a true passive, "was put to sleep," which gives a strikingly beautiful sense. A purely middle use of *κοιμηθῆναι*, "fell asleep," is patent in such phrases as Ch P 3 *ἡνίκα ἤμελλον κοιμηθῆναι ἔγραψα ἐπιστόλια β* (iii/B.C.). The active *κοιμᾶν* however, though apparently dormant in classical prose,[2] revives in the LXX, as Gen 24^{11}. We may also compare the clear passive in FP 110 (i/A.D.) *ἵνα τὰ πρόβατα ἐκεῖ κοιμηθῆι*, "may *be folded*," as the edd. translate. It seems possible therefore to conceive the passive force existing side by side with the simple intransitive, as apparently happened in *ἐστάθην* (see note [1] below); but we cannot speak with confidence.

---

[1] So Ac 3^8 D: cf Trygaeus in Arist. *Pax* 291 (Blass).

[2] To match these specimens of formal passives with middle meaning, we may cite middles in passive sense. Thus BU 1053, 1055 (i/B.C.) τὸ ἐν ὀφιλῇ θησόμενον, "the amount that shall be charged as due."

Common Ground.

Perhaps the matter is best summed up with the remark that the two voices were not differentiated with anything like the same sharpness as is inevitable in analytic formations such as we use in English. We have seen how the bulk of the forms were indifferently middle or passive, and how even those which were appropriated to one voice or the other are perpetually crossing the frontier. Common ground between them is to be observed in the category for which we use the translation "submit to," "let oneself be," etc.[3] Thus in Tb P 35 (ii/B.C.) *ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσεται*, "will get himself accused," is a middle; but in 1 Co 6^7 *ἀδικεῖσθε* and *ἀποστερεῖσθε* are described as passives by Blass, who says that "'to let' in the sense of occasioning some result is expressed by the middle" (p. 185). The dividing line is a fine one at best. *Ἀπογράψασθαι* in Lk 2^5 might seem to determine the voice of the present in vv.$^{1.3}$, but Blass finds a passive in v.^{1} Is there adequate evidence for separating them? Formally *ἀποκόψονται*, Gal 5[12] (Dt 23[1]), is middle,[1] and so are *βάπτισαι*, and *ἀπόλουσαι*, Ac 22[16] (cf 1 Co 6[11] 10[2]); but if the tense were present or perfect, could we decide? The verb *ὑποτάσσω* furnishes us with a rather important application of this question. What is the voice of *ὑποταγήσεται* in 1 Co 15[28]? Is it passive—"be subjected" *by* as well as "*to* him that did subject all things to him"? Or is it middle—"be subject"? Findlay (*EGT in loc.*) calls it "middle in force, like the 2nd aor. pass. in Rom 10[3], in consistency with the initiative ascribed to Christ throughout." I incline to this, but without accepting the reflexive "subject himself," which accentuates the difference between the identical *ὑποταγῇ* and *ὑποταγήσεται*; the neutral "be subject" explains both, and the context must decide the interpretation. In Rom 10[3] the RV renders "did not subject themselves," despite the passive; and the reflexive is an accurate interpretation, as in *ὑποτάσσεσθε* Col 3[18]. The question next presents itself whether we are at liberty to press the passive force of the aorist and future and perfect of *ἐγείρω*, when applied to the Resurrection of Christ. A glance at the concordance will show how often *ἠγέρθην* etc. are merely intransitive; and we can hardly doubt that *ἠγέρθη*, in Mk 16[6] and the like, translated קם (cf Delitzsch). But if the context (as in 1 Co 15) strongly emphasises the action of God, the passive becomes the right translation. It is in fact more for the exegete than for the grammarian to decide between *rose* and *was raised*, even if the tense is apparently unambiguous: one may confess to a grave doubt whether the speaker of Greek really felt the distinction.[2]

---

[1] *Ἐστάθηκα* is used as aor. to *στέκω* "stand," and *ἐστήθηκα* to *στήνω* "place" (Thumb *Handb.* 92).

[2] Cf *πορεύειν* and *φοβεῖν*, which have entirely given up their active: we should hardly care to call *πορευθῆναι* and *φοβηθῆναι* passive. In MGr we have some exx. of the opposite tendency, as *δαιμονίζω* "drive mad" (Abbott 224, no. 47): in older Greek this verb is purely middle. See other exx. in Hatzidakis 198 f.

[3] Gal 5^2 *περιτέμνησθε* will serve as a good example.

---

[1] The verb must be similarly treated with reference to its *voice*, whether we translate with text or margin of RV. The various arguments in favour of the margin, to which the citation of Dt *l.c.* commits us above, are now reinforced by Ramsay's advocacy, *Expos.* for Nov. 1905, pp. 358 ff. He takes the wish rather more seriously than I have done (*infr.* 201); but I should be quite ready to go with Mr G. Jackson, in the same Expos., p. 373. See also Findlay *in loc.* (*Exp. B* 328 f.).

[2] On the Passive, reference should be made to Wellh. 25 f., for exx. showing how this voice was largely replaced by other locutions in Aramaic (especially the impersonal plural, p. 58 f. above), and consequently in Synoptic translations. One or two other problems, in which Voice is concerned, must be reserved. On *βιάζεται* in Mt 11[12], Lk 16[16], see *Expositor*, Oct. 1908, "Lexical Notes," *s.v.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE VERB: THE MOODS.

The Moods in general.

THE Moods which we have to discuss will be the Imperative, Subjunctive, and Optative, and those uses of the Indicative which make it a "*modus irrealis*." In this preliminary chapter we shall aim at evaluating the primary meanings of the Moods, leaving to the systematic grammar the exhaustive classification of their uses, especially in dependent clauses. The moods in question are characterised by a common subjective element, representing an attitude of mind on the part of the speaker. It is not possible for us to determine with any certainty the primitive root-idea of each mood. The Imperative is tolerably clear: it represented command—prohibition was not originally associated with it, and in Greek only partially elbowed its way in, to be elbowed out again in the latest developments of the language. The Subjunctive cannot be thus simply summarised, for the only certain predication we can make of its uses is that they all concern future time. We shall see that its force can mostly be represented by *shall* or *will*, in one of their various senses. Whether the Subjunctive can be morphologically traced to a single origin is very problematic. A possible unification, on the basis of a common mood-sign -*ā*-, was conjectured by the writer some years ago (*AJP* x. 285 f.: see the summary in Giles, *Manual*^{2} 460 n.). It is at least a curious coincidence that the mood-sign thus obtained for the Subjunctive should functionally resemble the -*yē*- under which the Optative can confessedly be unified. We are dealing with prehistoric developments, and it is therefore futile to speculate whether it would be more than a coincidence, should these two closely allied moods prove to have been formed by suffixes which make nouns of nearly identical function. However clearly the Optative may be reduced to a single formation, it gives us nevertheless no hope of assigning its meanings to a single root-idea: Optative and Potential, *may* and *might* in their various uses, defy all efforts to reduce them to a unity. In this book the discussion of the Potential might almost be drawn on the lines of the famous chapter on snakes in Iceland, but for literary survivals in the Lucan writings. (See pp. 197 ff.) No language but Greek has preserved both Subjunctive and Optative as separate and living elements in speech, and Hellenistic Greek took care to abolish this singularity in a fairly drastic way. It ought to be added, before we pass from this general introduction, that in a historical account of the Moods a fourth, the *Injunctive*, has to be interpolated, to explain certain phenomena which disturb the development of the others, and perhaps of the Indicative as well. The Injunctive was simply an imperfect or aorist indicative without the augment. Λύου, λύεσθε, λύσασθε, λύθητε, λύετε, λύσατε and σχές will suffice as specimens, enough to illustrate how largely it contributed to the formation of the Imperative. Syntactically it represented the bare combination of verbal idea with the ending which supplies the subject; and its prevailing use was for prohibitions, if we may judge from Sanskrit, where it still remains to some extent alive. The fact that this primitive mood thus occupies ground appropriate to the Subjunctive, while it supplies the Imperative ultimately with nearly all its forms, illustrates the syntactical nearness of the moods. Since the Optative also can express prohibition, even in the NT (Mk 11^{14}), we see how much common ground is shared by all the subjective moods.

Particles affecting Moods:— Ἄν.

Before taking the Moods in detail, we must tarry a little over the consideration of two important particles which vitally affect their constructions, ἄν and μή. The former of these is a very marked peculiarity of Greek. It is a kind of leaven in a Greek sentence: itself untranslatable, it may transform the meaning of a clause in which it is inserted. In Homer we find it side by side with another particle, κὲν or κὲ (probably Aeolic), which appears to be somewhat weaker in force: the later dialects generally select one or the other for exclusive use. The general definition of its meaning is not very easily laid down. "Under the circumstances," "in that case," "anyhow," may express it pretty well.[1] The idiomatic use of "just," common in Scotland, approximates to ἄν (κὲν) very fairly when used in apodosis: ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι, "I'll jist tak her mysel'." (See p. 239.) It had become stereotyped by the time we reach Hellenistic Greek, and we need not therefore trace its earlier development. Two originally connected usages are now sharply distinguished. In one, ἄν stands with optative or indicative, and imparts to the verb a contingent meaning, depending on an *if* clause, expressed or understood, in the context. In the other, the ἄν (in the NT period more often written ἐάν—see pp. 42 f., 56) has formed a close contact with a conjunction or a relative, to which it generally imparts the meaning *-soever*: of course this exaggerates the differentia in most cases. Here the subjunctive, invariable in Attic, does not always appear in the less cultured Hellenistic writers. How greatly this use preponderates in the NT will best be shown by a table[2]:—

	Ἄν (ἐάν) with subj. (or indic.) joined with relative or conjunction.	Ἄν conditional, with verb.				
		With indic.			With opt.	
		Impf.	Aor.	Pluperf.	Pres.	Aor.
Mt . . .	55	1	7	0	0	0
Mk . . .	30	0	1	0	0	0
Lk . . .	28	2	4	0	3	1
Ac . . .	10	0	1	0	3	2
Jn, 1 Jn, 3 Jn .	15	7	7	1	0	0
		(incl. ᾔδειτε *bis*)				
Rev . . .	5	0	0	0	0	0
Paul . . .	27	3	3	0	0	0
Heb . . .	1	4	1	0	0	0
Jas . . .	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total .	172	17	24	1	6	3

---

[1] Brugmann *Gram.*^{3} 499 gives "allenfalls, eventuell, unter Umständen."

[2] The corresponding figures for the LXX will be instructive. A rough count in HR gives 739 as the total occurrences of ἄν (including κἄν), apart from ἐάν = ἄν. Out of these 26 are with aor. opt.; εἴη comes 3 times and ἔχοιμι once (in 4 Mac, an artificial work which supplies by itself 11 out of the exx. just noted); 22 can be classified as iterative; 41 are with aor. indic., 6 with imperf. and 1 with pluperf.; and 8 are abnormal (6 with relative and fut. indic., and 1 each with pres. indic. and fut. indic.). I have included all cases in which ἄν was read by any of the authorities cited in Swete's manual edition.

The disproportion between these totals—172 and 51—would be immensely increased if ἐάν (*if*) and ὅταν were added. We shall see later (pp. 198 and 200) that the conditional ἄν is rapidly decaying. The other use, though extremely abundant in our period, falls away rapidly long before the papyri fail us; and even within the NT we notice some writers who never show it, or only very seldom. This prepares us for the ultimate disappearance of the particle except in composition (MGr ἄν *if*, from the old ἄ̓ν;[1] σάν *as* or *when*, from ὡς ἄν—see below; and κἄν *even*, used like the NT κἄν = καί, not affecting construction).

Iterative ἄν.

ὡς ἄν.

We proceed to mention a few miscellaneous points in the NT use of ἄν. There are three places in which the old *iterative* force seems to survive: Ac 2^{45} and 4^{35} καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν, and 1 Co 12^{2} ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε.[2] "As you *would* be led (from day to day)" translates the last by an English iterative construction which coincides with the conditional, as in Greek: Goodwin *MT* § 249 pleads for a historical connexion of these two uses of ἄν. The aorist no longer appears in this construction as in classical Greek. Then we should note the appearance of ὡς ἄν in constructions which foreshadow the MGr idiom just mentioned.[3] Rom 15^{24} is an interesting case, because of the *present* subjunctive that follows: "when I am on my way" (durative) transfers into the subjunctive the familiar use of present for future. In 1 Co 11^{34} it has the easier aorist, "whenever I shall have arrived," and so in Phil 2^{23}. In 2 Co 10^{9}, however, it means "as it were."[4] MGr σάν has gone further, and takes the indicative as an ordinary word for *when*. The weakening of the connexion between compounds of ἄν and the subjunctive is seen in the appearance of the indicative with

---

[1] On ἄ̓ν and ἐάν (*if*) in NT see above, p. 43 n.

[2] Winer (p. 384) would make all these parallel with the use of ὅπου ἄν c. indic. in Mk 6^{56} and the like. I deal with the question below.

[3] For vernacular evidence see Par P 26 (ii/B.C.—with gen. abs.), 46 (ii/B.C.—with aor. subj.); BM 20 (ii/B.C.) συνέταξας ὡς ἂν εἰς Μέμφιν; *OGIS* 90^{23} (ii/B.C.—the Rosetta Stone) ὡς ἂν . . . συνεστηκυίας, etc. Exx. are numerous.

[4] Both the exx. of ἄν c. partic. quoted by Winer (p. 378) are ὡς ἄν: add 2 Mac 12^{4}. I have noted *one* ex. of genuine ἂν c. ptc. in a Κοινή inscr., *IMA* iii. 174 δικαιότερον ἂν σωθέντα (= *Syll.* 356, a despatch of Augustus).

Ὅταν, etc. c. indic.

ὅταν and *ἐάν* (*if*), and other words of the kind. So not infrequently in Mk, as 3^{11} *ὅταν ἐθεώρουν*, 11^{25} *ὅταν στήκετε*, 11^{19} *ὅταν ἐγένετο*: add Rev 4^{9} *ὅταν δώσουσιν*, 8^{1} *ὅταν ἤνοιξεν*. Parallel with these are Mk 6^{56} *ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο* and *ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο*, Rev 14^{4} *ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει* (where however we are entirely free to spell *ὑπάγῃ* if we like). Since these are in the least cultured of NT writers, and include presents and futures as well as past tenses, we should hardly class them with the cases of iterative *ἄν* just given from well-educated writers such as Luke and Paul, though there is an obvious kinship. If *ἄν* added *-ever* to the force of a relative or conjunction, there seemed no reason to forbid its use with a past tense where that meaning was wanted. The papyri yield only a small number of parallels, showing that in general the grammatical tradition held. Thus BU 607 (ii/A.D.) *ὁπόταν ἀναιροῦνται*, FP 126 (iv/A.D.) *ὅσ' ἂν πάσχετε*, Par P 26 (ii/B.C.) *ὅταν ἔβημεν κατ' ἀρχὰς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν* (= merely *when*), BU 424 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἐπὰν ἐπυθόμην* (also = *when*), BM 331 ii/A.D.) *ὅσα ἐὰν παρελαβόμην*.[a] The tendency to drop the distinction of *when* and *whenever*[b] may be connected with the fact that *ὁπότε* is freely used for *when* in papyri—so the later uncials in Lk 6^{3}. *Ἐάν* with indicative is found in 1 Th 3^{8} *στήκετε*, 1 Jn 5^{15} *οἴδαμεν*, to mention only two cases in which indic. and subj. are not formally identical in sound. Winer quotes even *ἐὰν ἦσθα*, from Job 22^{3} (*ᾖς* A), just as in Hb P 78 (iii/B.C.), where *ἦσθα* is certainly subj., and *ἐὰν ἦσαν* in Tb P 333 (iii/A.D.). They are probably extensions from the ambiguous *ἐὰν ἦν*, which is normally to be read *ᾖ*: see *CR* xv. 38, 436, and above, p. 49. We may add a selection from papyri:—Par P 18 *ἐὰν μαχοῦσιν μετ' ἐσοῦ*. 62 (ii/B.C.) *ἐάνπερ ἐκπληρώσουσιν*. Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.) *ἐὰν δεῖ*. BU 546 (Byz.) *ἐὰν οἶδεν*. OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν δ' εἰσίν*. AP 93 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν φαίνεται*.

Ἄν dropped from its compounds.

The same lesson is taught by conjunctions which still take the subjunctive, though *ἄν* has been allowed to fall out. It does not seem to make any difference whether *ἕως* or *ἕως ἄν* is written. So with many other compounds. Thus PP i. 13 (Ptol.) *ὅσα*

---

[a] See p. 239.

[b] See p. 248.

ὀφείλωσίν τινες, CPR 24, 25 (ii/A.D.) *ἐφ' ὃν ᾖ χρόνον*, 237 *ὅσα αὐτῷ προστέκηται*, Tb P 6 (ii/B.C.) *ἕως μένωσι*, GH 38 (i/B.C.) *ἕως καταβῇς*, OP 34 (ii/A.D.) *μήτε διδότω . . . πρὶν αὐτῷ ἐπιστέλληται*, etc., etc. The prevalence of this omission in the papyri with conjunctions meaning *until* (*ἄχρι*, *μέχρι*, *μέχρι οὗ*, *ἕως*, *πρίν*, *πρὸ τοῦ*, etc.), is paralleled in the NT: cf Mk 14^{32}, 2 Pet 1^{19}, Lk 13^{8}, etc.—see the list in WM 371. With *πρὶν* (*ἤ*), however, the *ἄν* occurs in the only place (Lk 2^{26}) where it is used with subjunctive.[1]

Εἰ μήτι ἄν. In 1 Co 7^{5} *μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μήτι ἂν* [om. B, probably to ease a difficulty] *ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρόν*, we have a curious combination which seems to be matched in the papyri.[2] So BU 326 (ii/A.D.) *εἴ τι ἐὰν ἀνθρώπινον πά[θῃ]*, and *εἴ τι ἐὰν μετὰ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα καταλίπω*, "if I should leave a codicil": the latter phrase is repeated subsequently without *ἐάν* in this rather illiterate will. OP 105 (ii/A.D.) *εἴ τι ἄλλο αἰὰν* ⟨*ἔ*⟩*χω*. FP 130 (iii/A.D.) *εἴ τινος ἠὰν χρία σοί ἐστιν*. BM 233 (iv/A.D.) *εἴ τι ἂν ἀπαξαπλῶς ἀναλώσῃς*. These documents are too illiterate for illustrating Paul: some early scribe is more likely to be responsible than the apostle. Note that Origen quotes *ἐὰν μήτι*. This explanation (Deissmann's) seems on the whole preferable to the alternative cited from Buttmann in WM 380 n. Winer's editor himself compared the *ἄν* to that in *κἄν* and *ὡς ἄν* which does not affect construction: cf Tb P 28 (ii/B.C.) *εἰ κἂν δύναται*.

Μή. More important still in its influence on the moods is the subjective negative *μή*, the distinction between which and the objective *nĕ* (replaced in Greek by *οὐ*) goes back to the period of Indo-Germanic unity, and survives into the Greek of the present day. The history of *μή* has been one of continuous aggression. It started in principal clauses, to express prohibition. As early as Homer

---

[1] Luke once uses it with subj. and once with opt., both times correctly with a negative clause preceding (Lk *l.c.*, Ac 25^{16}). The papyrus writers are not so particular. Elsewhere in NT the infin. construction is found.

[2] See Deissmann *BS* 204 n. He quotes BU 326, but will not allow that *εἰ μήτι ἄν* is a kind of analysis of *ἐὰν μήτι*, though this gives the meaning correctly. Blass^2, p. 321, has not summarised him quite adequately, if I understand Deissmann correctly. The point is that *ἄν* is added to *εἰ μήτι* as it might be to *ὅπου* or *ὅτε*, meaning *unless in a given case*, *unless perhaps*. See further p. 239.

μή had established itself in a large and complex variety of uses, to which we have to appeal when we seek to know the true nature of the modal constructions as we come to them. Since every Greek grammar gives the ordinary rules distinguishing the uses of *οὐ* and *μή*, we need not examine them here in their historical relationship: what must be said will come up best as we deal with the moods *seriatim.* But the broad differences between Hellenistic and earlier Greek in this respect raise questions affecting the moods as a whole, and especially the verb infinite. We must therefore sketch the subject briefly here.

Blass's Canon. The difference between *οὐ* and *μή* in the *Κοινή* of the NT becomes a very simple matter if we accept the rule which Blass lays down (p. 253). "All instances," he says, "may practically be brought under the single rule, that *οὐ* negatives the indicative, *μή* the other moods, including the infinitive and participle." In reviewing Blass, Thumb makes the important addition that in MGr *δέν* (from *οὐδέν*, which stepped into the place of *οὐ*, as we can easily understand from many of its adverbial uses in NT) belongs to the indicative and *μή(ν)* to the subjunctive. The classical paper of Gildersleeve in the first number of his *AJP* (1880), on encroachments of *μή* upon *οὐ* in the later Greek, especially in Lucian, makes it very clear that the Attic standard was irrecoverable in Lucian's day even by the most scrupulous of Atticists: cf the parallel case of the optative (below, p. 197). It is of course obvious that the ultimate goal has not been completely reached in NT times. *Μή* has not been driven away from the indicative. Its use in questions is very distinct from that of *οὐ*,[1] and is maintained in NT Greek without real weakening. *Μή* remains after *εἰ* c. indic. in unfulfilled conditions, except in Mk 14^{21} (and Mt). But in simple conditions *εἰ οὐ* is common Luke has 6, Jn 3, Paul 16, Jas 2, and Mt, Heb, 2 Pet, and Rev one each. Against this total of 31, we have 4 exx. of *εἰ μή* in simple conditions with verb expressed, and three of these (1 Co 15^{2}, 2 Co 13^{5}, Gal 1^{7}) are anything but normal:[1] 1 Tim 6^{3} is more ordinary, according to classical standards. Blass adds *εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας* from the agraphon in D at Lk 6^{4}. *Εἰ μή* is three times as common in NT as *εἰ οὐ*, but we soon see that it is restricted to three uses: (1) in protasis of unreal conditions; (2) meaning *except*, much like *πλήν*; (3) with *δέ*, meaning *otherwise*, without verb expressed. Lk 9^{13}, with a deliberative subjunctive following, is exceptional. Such being the facts, it is difficult to combat the assertion that *εἰ οὐ* came to be the norm;[2] though doubtless several of its exx. were correct according to classical standards, as in Rom 8^{9}, where a single word is negatived rather than a sentence. A few survivals of *μή* in relative sentences preserve literary construction; so Ac 15^{29} D, 1 Jn 4^{3} (unless we desert the extant MSS for patristic evidence and read *λύει*, with WHmg and Blass), Tit 1^{11}, 2 Pet 1^{9}. A genuine example of the old distinction is traceable in the otherwise identic phrases of Jn 3^{18} and 1 Jn 5^{10}: the former states the *charge, quod non crediderit*, the latter the simple *fact, quod non credidit.* But it must be allowed that this is an isolated case.[1] We will leave to the next chapter the only other exception to Blass's canon, the limited use of *οὐ* with the participle.

---

[1] Blass (p. 254 n.) thinks that *μήτι* in Jn 21^{5} "hardly lends itself to the meaning 'certainly not I suppose.'" But the tone of this word, introducing a *hesitant* question (as Jn 4^{29}), is not really inappropriate. We often hear "I suppose you haven't got . . . on you, have you?" Moreover, the papyri show us that *προσφάγιον* is not so broad a word as "something to eat." See my note, *Expos.* VI. viii. 437, to which I can now add OP 736 and 738 (cir. A.D. 1). The apostles had left even *ἄρτοι* behind them once (Mk 8^{14}): they might well have left the "relish" on this occasion. It would normally be fish; cf Mk 6^{38}. (While speaking of Jn *l.c.*, I should like to add that the address *Παιδία*, "Lads!", may be paralleled in MGr, *e.g.* in the Klepht ballad, Abbott 42—*παιδία μου* and *παιδία*, to soldiers.) See further p. 239.

The Imperative:—

First among the Moods we take up the Imperative. It is the simplest possible form of the verb. *Ἄγε* the imperative of *ἄγω*, and *ἀγέ* the vocative of *ἀγός*, are both of them interjections formed by isolating the root and adding no suffix—the thematic vowel *ε* is now generally regarded as a part of the root rather than a suffix. In our own language, where nouns and verbs have in hosts of cases reunited through the disappearance of suffixes, we can represent this identity easily. "Murder!", in Russia or Armenia, might be either verb or noun—a general order to soldiers charging a crowd, or the scream of one of the victims. The interjection, as we might expect, was indifferently used for 2nd and 3rd person, as is still shown by the Latin *agito*, Skt. *ajatāt*, (= *age* + *tōd*, the ablative of a demonstrative pronoun, " from this (moment)," added to make the command more peremptory). How close is the kinship of the interjection and the imperative, is well shown by the demonstrative adverb δεῦρο, " hither," which only needs the exclamation mark to make it mean " come here ": it even forms a plural δεῦτε in this sense. We shall recall this principle when we describe the use of the infinitive in commands.

---

[1] See below, p. 239.

[2] See p. 240.

Tone of Imperative.

There being in Greek a considerable variety of forms in which one man may express to another a wish that is to control his action, it will be necessary to examine the tone of that mood which is appropriated to this purpose. As we might expect from our own language, the imperative has a very decided tone about it. The context will determine how much stress it is carrying: this may vary from mere permission, as in Mt 8^{32} (cf ἐπέτρεψεν in the presumed source Mk 5^{13}) or 1 Co 7^{15}, to the strongest command. A careful study of the imperative in the Attic Orators, by Prof. C. W. E. Miller (*AJP* xiii. 399 ff.), brings out the essential qualities of the mood as used in hortatory literature. The grammarian Hermogenes asserted harshness to be a feature of the imperative;[1] and the sophist Protagoras even blamed Homer for addressing the Muse at the beginning of the *Iliad* with an imperative.[2] By a discriminating analysis of the conditions under which the orators use the imperative, Miller shows that it was most avoided in the proem, the part of the speech where conciliation of the audience's favour was most carefully studied; and the criticism of Protagoras, which the ancients took more seriously than many moderns have done, is seen to be simply due to the rhetorician's applying to poetry a rule that was unchallenged in rhetoric. If a cursory and limited observation may be trusted, the *ēthos* of the imperative had not changed in the age of the papyri. Imperatives are normal in royal edicts, in letters to inferiors, and among equals when the tone is urgent, or the writer indisposed to multiply words: they are conspicuously few in petitions. When we come to the NT, we find a very different state of things. The prophet is not accustomed to conciliate his hearers with carefully softened commands; and in the imperial edicts of Him who "taught with authority," and the ethical exhortations of men who spoke in His name, we find naturally a large proportion of imperatives. Moreover, even in the language of prayer the imperative is at home, and that in its more urgent form, the aorist. Gildersleeve observes (on Justin Martyr, p. 137), "As in the Lord's Prayer, so in the ancient Greek liturgies the aor. imper. is almost exclusively used. It is the true tense for 'instant' prayer." The language of petition to human superiors is full of *δέομαι, καλῶς ποιήσεις*, and various other periphrases whereby the request may be made palatable. To God we are bidden by our Lord's precept and example to present the claim of faith in the simplest, directest, most urgent form with which language supplies us.

---

[1] *Σχήματα δὲ τραχέα μάλιστα μὲν τὰ προστακτικά.*

[2] *Ap.* Aristotle *Poetics* ch. 19.

Tenses of Imperative.

The distinction between present and aorist imperative has been drawn already, to some extent, in the discussion of prohibitions; for though the subjunctive has to be used in the aorist, it is difficult to question that for this purpose the two moods hardly differ—the reason for the ban on *μὴ ποίησον* lies buried in the prehistoric stage of the language. And whatever the distinction may be, we must apply the same essential principles to commands and prohibitions, which were felt by the Greeks to be logically identical categories: see Miller *op. cit.* 416. The only difference will be that the meaning of *μὴ ποιήσῃς* (above, pp. 122 ff.) comes from the future sense inherent in the subjunctive, while in estimating the force of *ποίησον* we have nothing but the aorist idea to consider. This, as we have often repeated, lies in the "point action" involved. In the imperative therefore the conciseness of the aorist makes it a decidedly more sharp and urgent form than the present. The latter may of course show any of the characteristics of linear action. There is the iterative, as in Lk 11^3, the conative as in Mk 9^{39} ("do not try to stop him, as you are doing"), Phil 2^{12} ("set to working out"); and of course the simple durative *passim.* Writers differ in their preferences between the tenses. Thus 1 Pet shows a marked liking for the aorist, which he has 22 times in commands (2nd pers.), against 6 presents; on the other hand Paul has 9 presents to 1 aorist (apart from LXX citations) in Gal, and 20 to 2 in Phil. In Mt 5–7 the presents (still 2nd pers.) are 19 to 24, and in corresponding parts of Lk 21 to 16. In seven passages only do the two evangelists use different tenses, and in all of them the accompanying variation of phraseology accounts for the difference in a way which shows how delicately the distinction of tenses was observed. Mt 5^{42} = Lk 6^{30}, and Mt 6^{11} = Lk 11^{3}, we have dealt with. Mt 5^{12} has continuous presents, following *ὅταν* c. aor. subj.: in Lk 6^{23} a little more stress on the ingressive element in these aorists makes the addition *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* suitable, and this carries with it the aor. imper. In Lk 12^{58} *δός* is natural with *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*: Mt 5^{25} has *ἴσθι εὐνοῶν*, which is curious in view of *ταχύ*. But since *εἰμί* has no aorist, it is not surprising that its imperative is sometimes quasi-ingressive: cf Mk 5^{34}, Lk 19^{17}, and the phrase *γνωστὸν ἔστω* (Ac *ter*). The punctiliar *στρέψον*, *turn*, in Mt 5^{39} answers well to the linear *πάρεχε*, *hold out*, *offer*, in Lk 6^{29}. The vivid phrase *ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν* of Lk 13^{24} may well preserve more of the original than the constative *εἰσέλθατε* of Mt 7^{13}. In all these cases some would recognise the effects of varying translation from an Aramaic original, itself perhaps not wholly fixed in detail; but we see no trace of indifference to the force of the tenses. The remaining example is in a quotation from Ps 6^{9}, in which Mt 7^{23} preserves the LXX except in the verb *ἀποχωρεῖτε*, while Lk 13^{27} modifies the address to *ἐργάται ἀδικίας*: here it is enough to say that the perfective *ἀποχωρεῖτε* may have quasi-ingressive sense even in the present.

Third Person Imperative.

We have so far discussed only commands and prohibitions in the 2nd person. Not much need be added as to the use of the 3rd. Here the veto on the aorist in prohibition is withdrawn: we need not stay to ask why. Thus in Mt 6^{3} *μὴ γνώτω*, $24^{17.\ 18}$ *μὴ καταβάτω . . . μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω*, which all come under ordinary aorist categories. As in classical Greek, the 3rd person is naturally much less common than the 2nd.

Expressions for First Person.

Though the 1st person is not formally brought in under the Imperative, it will be well to treat it here: a passage like Mk 14^{42} *ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν* shows that logically it is fair to speak of three persons in the imperative mood, since *ἄγωμεν* only differs from *ἐγείρεσθε* in that the speaker is included with the objects of the command. That this should affect the tone of the command is of course inevitable; but indeed all three persons necessarily differ considerably in the *êthos* they severally show. The closeness of connexion between this volitive subjunctive 1st person and the regular imperative is well seen in Sanskrit, where the Vedic subjunctive is obsolete in the epic period except for the 1st person, which stands in the grammars as an ordinary part of the imperative—*bharāma, bharata, bharantu,* like *φέρωμεν, φέρετε, φερόντων* (Att.). In Hellenistic Greek the imperative 1st person is beginning to be differentiated from other subjunctives by the addition of *ἄφες, ἄφετε,* a use which has recently appeared in a papyrus of the Roman period (OP 413, *ἄφες ἐγὼ αὐτὴν θρηνήσω*), and has become normal in MGr (*ἄς* with 1st and 3rd subj. making imperative). This is always recognised in Mt 7^4 = Lk 6^{42}: why not in 27^{49} = Mk 15^{36} one has never been able to see. To force on Mt a gratuitous deviation from Mk seems a rather purposeless proceeding. Translating both passages simply "Let us see," the only difference we have left is in the speakers, which is paralleled by several similar variations (Hawkins *HS* 56 ff.). It is possible that Jn 12^7, *ἄφες αὐτὴν ἵνα τηρήσῃ*,[1] has the same construction in the 3rd person, to be literally rendered like the rest by our auxiliary, "Let her keep it." (So practically RV text.) The alternative is "Let her alone: let her keep it," which is favoured by Mk 14^6. The acc. *αὐτήν*, compared with the *ἐγώ* seen in OP 413, discourages our treating *ἄφες* as a mere auxiliary.[2] We shall be seeing shortly that *ἵνα* c. subj. is an imperative (*ἵνα εἴπῃς* = MGr *νὰ ’πῇς*,[1] *say* !). The word had not yet by any means developed as far as our *let*, or its own MGr derivative *ἄς*. Note that it much more frequently takes the infin. (8 times in NT):[2] other parts of the verb take infin. 7 times and *ἵνα* c. subj. once (Mk 11^{16}). Our own word helps us in estimating the coexistence of auxiliary and independent verb in the same word: in our rendering of Mt 7^4 "allow me" is the meaning, but to substitute "allow" for "let" in a phrase like "let us go" would be impossible. *Ἄφες* is "let" as in "do let me go," while MGr *ἄς* is the simple auxiliary.

---

[1] *Τετήρηκεν* (α-text) is a self-evident correction.

[2] If we suppose the *τί κόπους παρέχετε*; (durative) to indicate that Judas and the rest were trying to stop Mary, the "let her keep it" (*τηρήσῃ* constative)

Perfect Imperative.

The scanty relics of the Perfect Imperative need detain us very briefly. In the active it never existed, except in verbs whose perfect had the force of a present:[3] we find *κεκραγέτωσαν* in LXX (Is 14^{31}), but no ex. in NT. In the passive it was fairly common in 3rd person (periphrastic form in plural), expressing "a command that something just done or about to be done shall be *decisive* and *final*" (Goodwin). We have this in Lk 12^{35}. The rare 2nd person is, Goodwin adds, "a little more emphatic than the present or aorist": it shares, in fact, the characteristic just noted for the 3rd person. Cf *πεφίμωσο* Mk 4^{39} with *φιμώθητι* 1^{25}. The epistolary *ἔρρωσο* in Ac 23^{30} (*α*-text), 15^{29} (*passim* in papyri), does not come in here, as the perfect has present meaning.

Substitutes for Imperative:—

We are ready now to look at the other forms of Command—we use the word as including Prohibition—which supplement the mood appropriated to this purpose. We shall find that forms of command can be supplied by all six moods of the verb—acquiescing for the moment in a convenient misuse of the term "mood," to cover all the subjects of this chapter and the next.

(1) Future Indicative;

The Future Indicative is exceedingly common in this sense.

---

may be taken as forbidding interference with an act already begun. That the *ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ* was already come, is stated as much by the *προέλαβεν* of Mk 14^8 as by the phrase in Jn. The action of v.[3] is narrated completely (as it is by Mk), before the interruption is described.

[1] Thumb *Handb.* 100.

[2] So Hb P 41 (iii/B.C.).

[3] Goodwin *MT* § 108.

It seems to come to it by two roads, as may be seen by the study of its negatives. A command like *οὐ φονεύσεις*, which can be seen in earlier Greek and becomes abundant in the Hellenistic vernacular, is proved by its *οὐ* to be a purely *futuristic* form. Such a future may have the tone of absolute indifference, as in the colloquial *σὺ ὄψῃ*, "you will see to that," Mt 27[4]. Or it may show that the speaker takes the tone of one who does not contemplate the bare possibility of disobedience. Thus in Euripides *Med.* 1320 *χειρὶ δ' οὐ ψαύσεις ποτέ*, "you *will* never be able to touch me," shades into "you *shall* never touch me." Against Winer's remark (p. 397) that this form "was considered milder than the imperative," we may set Gildersleeve's emphatic denial. "A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession" (*Synt.* 116). We have also a rare form in which the negative *μή* proclaims a *volitive* future, in its origin identical with the *μὴ ποιήσῃς* type already discussed. Demosthenes has *μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι*, and *μὴ ἔξεσται* BU 197 (i/A.D.), *μὴ ἀφήσις* BU 814 (iii/A.D.), show its sporadic existence in the vernacular *Κοινή*. Blass adds *μηδένα μισήσετε* from Clem. Hom. iii. 69.[a] These passages help to demonstrate the reality of this rare form against Gildersleeve's suspicions (*Synt.* 117).[1] Yet another volitive future is seen in the imperatival use of the future with *οὐ* in a question: Ac 13[10] *οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων;* Prediction and Command approximate in the NT use of *οὐ μή* (see below, pp. 187 ff.), which in Mt 15[5], Lk 1[15], Jn 13[8], Gal 4[30], and possibly elsewhere, is most naturally classed as imperatival.

(2) **Subjunctive**; Next among these forms of command comes the subjunctive, already largely dealt with. So we have had the 1st person, as Jn 14[31] *ἄγωμεν*, Gal 5[26] *μὴ γινώμεθα.* The future and the imperative between them carried off the old jussive use of the subjunctive in positive commands of 2nd and 3rd person. The old rule which in ("Anglicistic") Latin made *sileas!* an entirely grammatical retort discourteous to the Public Orator's *sileam?*

---

[1] To this class I should assign the use of *ὅπως* c. fut. = imper., as in Plato 337B *ὅπως μοι μὴ ἐρεῖς, don't tell me: ὅπως* is merely a conjunction, "in which case." Though common in colloquial Attic, it is mostly ousted in Hellenistic by *ἵνα*; but see Hb P 45, 60, 168 *al.* (iii/B.C.), Tb P 414 (ii/A.D.), BU 625 (ii/iii A.D.).

[[a] See pp. 240, 248.

—which in the dialect of Elis produced such phrases as *ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήᾱται Νικόδρομορ*, "let Nicodromus attend to it"[1]—has no place in classical or later Greek, unless in Soph. *Phil.* 300 (see Jebb). Add doubtfully Ll P 1 *vs.*^{8} (iii/B.C.), Tb P 414$^{26ff.}$ (ii/A.D.). We have dealt already with *μὴ ποιήσῃς*, the historical equivalent of the Latin *ne feceris.* In the 3rd person the subjunctive is little used: 1 Co 16^{11}, 2 Co 11^{16}, 2 Th 2^{3} are exx. The tone of these clauses is less peremptory than that of the imperative, as may be seen from their closeness to the clauses of warning. Such *μή* clauses, with subj.—rarely future (as in Col 2^{8}, Heb 3^{12}), which presumably makes the warning somewhat more instant—are often reinforced by *ὅρα*, *βλέπε*, or the like. It must not be supposed that the *μή* clause historically "depends on" this introductory word, so that there is an ellipsis when it stands alone. Even where the apparent governing verb is a real independent word and not a mere auxiliary—*e.g.* in Mk 14^{38}, *προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν*—the parataxis was probably once as real as it is in a phrase like Lk 12^{15} *ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε.* In Rev 19^{10} 22^{9} we find *μή* standing alone after *ὅρα*: cf our colloquial "Don't!" One important difference between prohibition and warning is that in the latter we may have either present or aorist subjunctive: Heb 12^{15} is an ex. of the present. But we must return to these sentences later. An innovation in Hellenistic is *ἵνα* c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classical *ὅπως* c. fut. indic. Whether it was independently developed, or merely came in as an obvious equivalent, we need not stop to enquire. In any case it fell into line with other tendencies which weakened the telic force of *ἵνα*; and from a very restricted activity in the vernacular of the NT period it advanced to a prominent position in MGr syntax (see above, p. 176). In the papyri we have a moderate number of exx., from which may be cited[2] FP 112 (99 A.D.) *ἐπέχον* (= -ων) *Ζωίλωι καὶ εἵνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσῃς*, "attend to *Z.* and don't look askance at him." An earlier ex. appears in a letter of Cicero (*Att.* vi. 5) *ταῦτα*

---

[1] Cauer 264 (iv/iii B.C.). It must however be noted that Brugmann (*Gram.*^{3} 500) calls the connexion of this with the prehistoric jussive 3rd sing. "sehr zweifelhaft": he does not give his reasons.

[2] Earlier are Tb P 408 (3 A.D.), BU 1079 (41 A.D.).

οὖν, πρῶτον μέν, ἵνα πάντα σῴζηται· δεύτερον δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγωρήσῃς. Winer (WM 396) would find it "in the Greek poets," citing however only Soph. *OC* 155. W. F. Moulton, in setting this aside as solitary and dubious, observes that the scholiast took the passage this way—in his day of course the usage was common.[a] An ex. for the 1st person may be added: BU 48 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἐὰν ἀναβῇς τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα.* In the NT the clearest ex. is Eph 5^{33} *ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα,* which is correlated with *ἀγαπάτω* in the first clause. So 1 Co 7^{29}, 2 Co 8^{7}, Mk 5^{23}: Gal 2^{10} is the same construction put indirectly. Mk 10^{51} and parallels have really the same: *θέλω ἵνα* more nearly coalesce in Mk 6^{25} 10^{35}, Jn 17^{24}. The combination *θέλω ἵνα,*[b] which of course is not confined to quasi-imperative use, gave birth ultimately to the MGr auxiliary *θά* (*θενά*, etc.), forming the future tense. **(3) Optative;** The Optative can express commands through either of its main constructions, but its evanescence in the *Κοινή* naturally limits NT illustrations. The Optative proper (neg. *μή*), however, does occur in Mk 11^{14}: note that Mt (21^{19}) substitutes the familiar construction *οὐ μή* c. subj. The Potential with *ἄν* (neg. *οὐ*), as *λέγοις ἄν*, "pray speak," is not found in NT at all.[1] **(4) Infinitive;** The imperatival Infinitive has been needlessly objected to. It is unquestionable in Phil 3^{16}, Rom 12^{15}, and highly probable in Tit 2^{2-10}: we must not add Lk 9^{3}, which is merely a case of mixed direct and indirect speech. The epistolary *χαίρειν*, Ac 15^{23} 23^{26}, Jas 1^{1}, is the same in origin. We no longer need Winer's reminder (p. 397) that the verbs in 1 Th 3^{11}, 2 Th 2^{17} 3^{5} are optatives; but it is well to note that our assurance rests on something better than the accentuation, which any one of us may emend, if he sees fit, without any MS that counts saying him nay. The infin. for imper. was familiar in Greek, especially in laws and in maxims. It survives in the *Κοινή*, as the papyri show: on AP 86 (i/A.D.), *ἐξεῖναι* and *μισθῶσαι*, cf Radermacher in *RhM* lvii. 147, who notes it as a popular use.[c] Hatzidakis shows (p. 192) that in the Pontic dialect, the only form of MGr in which the infinitive form survives, the infin. is still used as an imperative for all numbers and persons. We have therefore every reason to expect it in the NT, and its rarity there is the only matter for surprise.[1] Last among

---

[1] An ex. perhaps occurs in Par P 42 (ii/B.C.), *χαρίζου* (?=-οιο) *δ' ἂν καὶ τού σώματος ἐπιμελόμενος ἵν' ὑγιαίνῃς.*

[[a] [b] [c] See p. 248.

(5) Participle. these substitutes for the imperative comes the Participle, the admission of which, despite Winer's objections (p. 441), is established beyond question by the papyri. The proof of this will be given when we deal with the Participle in its place. Here it is sufficient to point out that a passage like 1 Pet $3^{8f.}$, where adjectives and participles alike obviously demand the unexpressed ἐστέ, gives us the rationale of the usage clearly enough. It is a curious fact that while ἴσθι occurs 5 times in NT, ἔστω (ἤτω) 14, and ἔστωσαν twice, ἐστέ, which we should have expected to be common, does not appear at all. Γίνεσθε occurs and ἔσεσθε, but it seems more idiomatic to drop the copula: compare the normal absence of the verb with predicates like μακάριος, κατάρατος, εὐλογητός, οὐαί, which sometimes raises doubts whether an indicative or an imperative (optative) is understood. We are accordingly absolved from inventing an anacoluthon, or some other grammatical device when we come to such a passage as Rom 12^{9-19}, where adjectives and participles, positive and negative, in imperative sense are interrupted by imperatives in vv.$^{14.\ 16.\ 19}$ and infinitives in v.^{15}. The participles are obviously durative in their action: this is well seen in v.^{19}, where ἐκδικοῦντες, meaning either "do not avenge yourselves (whenever wronged)"—iterative sense—or "do not (as your tendency is)" (*supr.* p. 125), is strongly contrasted with the decisive aorist δότε, "once and for all make room for the Wrath[2] (which alone can do justice on wrong)." The infinitives are appropriate in the concise maxim of v.^{15}. Assuming the cogency of the vernacular evidence given on p. 223 below, we may select the following as probable exx. of imperatival participle from the list of passages in which the absence of such evidence compelled Winer *l.c.* to adopt other interpretations[1]:—1 Pet $3^{1.\,7}$ 2^{18} $4^{3\text{ff.}}$: in this last passage ἔχοντες might of course be constructed with νήψατε, and at first sight it seems possible in this way to avoid an asyndeton. But πρὸ πάντων only introduces a series of asyndetic precepts, in which φιλόξενοι and διακονοῦντες must have the same construction. To supply the imperative idea (as in 4^{11}) seems simplest, though of course vv.$^{8-11}$ are all still dependent on the imperatives of v.^{7}. Since Peter is evidently given to this construction, we may take 2^{12} in the same way, though it would pass as an easy *constr. ad sensum* with v.^{11}: one would be inclined to add 1^{14}, but Hort's alternative must be noted.[2] These are all the passages we can accept from Winer's list of exx. proposed; a glance at the unrecorded remainder will vividly show what astounding fatuities, current in his day, the great grammarian had to waste his space in refuting. But we may extend the list somewhat. Paul was not so fond of this construction as his brother apostle: note how in 1 Pet 3^{1}, echoing Eph 5^{22}, the ὑποτασσόμεναι is slipped into the place where Paul (according to B and Jerome) left an ellipsis, having used the verb just before in a regular sequence. But the exx. we have already had are conclusive for Paul's usage. Add Col 3^{16} (note the imperative to be supplied after πάντα in v.^{17}), 2 Co $9^{11.\,13}$ and Eph $4^{2.\,3}$ (cf 1 Pet 2^{12}).[3] In 2 Co 8^{24} ἐνδεικνύμενοι is read by B (and the δ-text uncials,—presumably the reason why WH relegate it to the margin): it is however obvious that the ἐνδείξασθε of ℵC and the later uncials is not likely to be original as against the participle, which would challenge correction. The imper. in Versions counts for little, if we are right in our account of the idiom; but the participle *ustaiknyandans* in Wulfila is a noteworthy piece of evidence on the other side. 2 Co 9[11] is more simply explained this way than by the assumption of a long parenthesis. Rom 13[11] means "and this (do) with knowledge," the participle being rather the complement of an understood imperative than imperative itself. Heb 13[5] gives us an ex. outside Peter and Paul. With great hesitation, I incline to add Lk 24[47], punctuating with WHmg: "Begin ye from Jerusalem as witnesses of these things." The emphatic ὑμεῖς, repeated in v.[49], thus marks the contrast between the Twelve, for whom Jerusalem would always be the centre, and one to be raised up soon who would make the world his parish: the hint is a preparation for Luke's Book II. There are difficulties, but they seem less than the astonishing breach of concord which the other punctuation forces on so correct a writer. (See p. 240.) On this usage in general W. F. Moulton (WM 732 n.) sided with Winer, especially against T. S. Green's suggestion that it was an Aramaism; but he ends with saying "In Heb 13[5], Rom 12[9ff.], it must not be forgotten that by the side of the participles stand *adjectives*, with which the imperative of εἶναι is confessedly to be supplied." This is, as we have seen, the most probable reason of a use which new evidence allows us to accept without the misgivings that held back both Winer and his editor. It is not however really inconsistent with Lightfoot's suggestive note on Col 3[16], in which he says, "The absolute participle, being (so far as regards mood) neutral in itself, takes its colour from the general complexion of the sentence. Thus it is sometimes indicative (*e.g.* 2 Co 7[5], and frequently), sometimes imperative (as in the passages quoted [Rom 12[9f. 16f.], Eph 4[2f.], Heb 13[5], 1 Pet 2[12(?)] 3[1. 7. 9. 15. 16]]), sometimes optative (as [Col] 2[2], 2 Co 9[11], cf Eph 3[17])." The fact is, when we speak of a part of εἶναι being "understood," we are really using inexact language, as even English will show. I take the index to my hymn-book and note the first line of three of Charles Wesley's hymns:—"Happy the souls that first believed," "Happy soul that free from harms," "Happy soul, thy days are ended." In the first, on this grammatical principle, we should supply *were*, in the second *is* (*the*), while we call the third a vocative, that is, an interjection. But the very "!"-mark which concludes the stanza in each case shows that all three are on the same footing: "the general complexion of the sentence," as Lightfoot says, determines in what sense we are to take a grammatical form which is indeterminate in itself.

---

[1] See Deissmann *BS* 344. I do not however think there is any real ellipsis of a verb of command: see below, p. 203. Historically there is probably no ellipsis even in the epistolary χαίρειν. It should be stated that Viteau i. 146 claims this also as a Hebraism! See Thumb, *Hellen.* 130 f.; also Meisterhans^{3} 244–6, for its use in decrees.

[2] So the RV in the First Revision, and the American Revisers, beyond all question rightly. It is one more example of the baneful effects of the two-thirds rule upon the RV.

---

[1] We follow Winer's order, tacitly agreeing with his explanation when we pass over a passage cited. The exx. in which the ptc. would be indicatival will be dealt with below. (An important ex. is added on p. 240.)

[2] I must withdraw 5^{7}, cited in *Expos.* VI. x. 450: the participle there goes closely with ταπεινώθητε. Probably 3^{7} was meant—"sed μνημονικὸν ἁμάρτημα,' as Cicero says.

[3] 2 Co *l.c.* may be for indic. (so virtually RV)

Some Elliptical Imperative Clauses.

A few more words are called for upon the subject of defective clauses made into commands, prayers, imprecations, etc., by the exclamatory form in which they are cast, or by the nature of their context. In Rom 13[11] and Col 3[17] we have already met with imperatives needing to be supplied from the context: Mt 27[19. 25], Col 4[6], Gal 1[5] (see Lightfoot) and Jn 20[19] are interjectional clauses, and there is nothing conclusive to show whether imperative or optative, or in some like clauses (*e.g.* Lk 1[28]) indicative, of *εἶναι* would be inserted if the sentence were expressed in full logical form. Other exx. may be seen in WM 732 ff. But there is one case of heaped-up ellipses on which we must tarry a little, that of Rom 12[6–8]. There is much to attract, despite all the weight of contrary authority, in the punctuation which places only a comma at end of v.[5], or—what comes to nearly the same thing—the treatment of *ἔχοντες* as virtually equivalent to *ἔχομεν*: "But we have grace-gifts which differ according to the grace that was given us, whether that of prophecy (differing) according to the measure of our faith, or that of service (differing) in the sphere of the service, or he that teaches (exercising—*ἔχων*—his gift) in his teaching, or he that exhorts in his exhorting, he who gives (exercising this charism) in singleness of purpose, he who holds office in a deep sense of responsibility, he who shows compassion in cheerfulness." In this way we have *διάφορον* supplied with *προφητείαν* and *διακονίαν*, and then the *ἔχοντες χαρίσματα* is taken up in each successive clause, in nearly the same sense throughout: the durative sense of *ἔχω*, *hold* and so *exercise*, must be once more remembered. But as by advancing this view we shall certainly fall under the condemnation for "hardihood," pronounced by such paramount authorities as SH, we had better state the alternative, which is the justification for dealing with this well-known crux here. The imperatival idea, which on the usual view is understood in the several clauses, must be derived from the fact that the prepositional phrases are successively thrown out as interjections. If we put into words the sense thus created, perhaps ἔστω will express as much as we have the right to express: we may have to change it to ὦμεν with ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ ("let us be wrapped up in," like ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι 1 Ti 4^{15}). In this way we arrive at the meaning given in paraphrase by the RV.

The Subjunctive.

We take next the most live of the Moods, the only one which has actually increased its activities during the thirty-two centuries of the history of the Greek language.[1] According to the classification adopted by Brugmann,[2] there are three main divisions of the subjunctive, the *volitive*, the *deliberative*, and the *futuristic*. Brugmann separates the last two, against W. G. Hale, because the former has μή as its negative, while the latter originally had οὐ. But the question may well be asked whether the first two are radically separable. Prof. Sonnenschein well points out (*CR* xvi. 166) that the "deliberative" is only "a question as to what is or was to be done." A command may easily be put in to the interrogative tone: witness οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον; *quin redeamus?* (=*why should we not?* answering to *redeamus*=*let us*), and our own "*Have some?*" The objection to the term "deliberative," and to the separation of the first two classes, appears to be well grounded. It should further be observed that the future indicative has carried off not only the futuristic but also the volitive and deliberative subjunctives; cf such a sentence as εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν; ἢ τί δράσομεν;[3] With the *caveat* already suggested, we may outline the triple division. **(1) Volitive;** The Volitive has been treated largely under the substitutes for the imperative. We must add the use with μή in *warning*, which lies near that in prohibition; cf Mt 25^9. Introductory words like φοβοῦμαι, σκόπει, etc., did not historically determine the construction: thus Heb 4^1 was really "Let us fear! haply one of you may . . .!"[a] Out of the Volitive arose the great class of dependent clauses of Purpose, also paratactic in origin. The closeness of relation between future and subjunctive is seen in the fact that final clauses with ὅπως c. fut. were negatived with μή: the future did not by any means restrict itself to the futuristic use of the mood which it pillaged. On the so-called Deliberative we have **(2) Deliberative;** already said nearly enough for our purpose. It is seen in questions, as Mk 12^{14} δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; Mt 23^{33} πῶς φύγητε; Rom 10^{14} πῶς ἐπικαλέσωνται; The question may be dependent, as Lk 9^{54} θέλεις εἴπωμεν;[1] *ib.* ^{58}, with which cf Marcus viii. 50, ἔχουσι ποῦ αὐτὰ ῥίψωσι. We see it both with and without ἵνα in Lk 18^{41}. In the form of the future we meet it in sentences like Lk 22^{49} εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; The present subjunctive may possibly be recognised in Mt 11^3 ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; Finally, the **(3) Futuristic.** Futuristic is seen still separate from the future tense in the Homeric καὶ ποτέ τις Ϝείπῃσι, and in isolated relics in Attic Greek, like τί πάθω; Its primitive use reappears in the Κοινή, where in the later papyri the subjunctive may be seen for the simple future. Blass (p. 208) quotes it occurring as early as the LXX, Is 33^{24} ἀφεθῇ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία.[2] So Ac 7^{34} (LXX). From the futuristic subjunctive the dependent clauses with ἐάν and ὅταν sprang: the negative μή, originally excluded from this division of the subjunctive, has trespassed here from the earliest times. There is one passage where the old use of the subjunctive in comparisons seems to outcrop, Mk 4^{26} ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον . . . καὶ καθεύδῃ (etc., all *pres.* subj.).[3][b] Mr Thackeray quotes Is 7^2 17^{11} 31^4. To place this use is hard—note Brugmann's remarks on the impossibility of determining the classification of dependent clauses in general,—but perhaps the futuristic suits best: cf our "as a man *will* sow," etc. The survival of this out-of-the-way subjunctive in the artless Greek of LXX and Mk is somewhat curious;

---

[1] So if we start from the mention of the Achaians on an Egyptian monument of 1275 B.C.—'*Ak̦aiwaša*='ΑχαιϜῶς, the prehistoric form of 'Αχαιοί. See Hess and Streitberg in *Indog. Forsch.* vi. 123 ff.

[2] *Gram.*^{3} 490 ff.

[3] Eurip. *Ion* 771. On the subjunctive element in the Greek future see above, p. 149. Lat. *ero*, *faxo*, Greek πίομαι, φάγομαι (Hellenistic mixture of ἔδομαι and ἔφαγον), χέω, are clear subjunctive forms, to name only a few.

---

[1] MGr θὰ εἰποῦμε; is simple future, *shall we say?*

[2] See p. 240.

[3] It must be noted that Blass^2 (p. 321) calls this impossible, and inserts ἐάν. But ℵBDLΔ and the best cursives agree on this reading: why should they agree on the *lectio ardua*? Ὡs ἐάν (AC) has all the signs of an obvious correction.

[a] See p. 248.

[b] See p. 249.

it is indeed hardly likely, in the absence of evidence from the intermediate period, that there is any real continuity of usage. But the root-ideas of the subjunctive changed remarkably little in the millennium or so separating Homer from the Gospels; and the mood which was more and more winning back its old domain from the future tense may well have come to be used again as a "gnomic future" without any knowledge of the antiquity of such a usage. Other examples of this encroachment will occur as we go on.

Tenses. The kind of action found in the present, aorist, and perfect subjunctive hardly needs further comment, the less as we shall have to return to them when we deal with the dependent clauses. One result of the aorist action has important exegetical consequences, which have been very insufficiently observed. It affects relative, temporal or conditional clauses introduced by pronoun or conjunction with *ἄν* (often *ἐάν* in NT, see pp. 42f). The verbs are all futuristic, and the *ἄν* ties them up to particular occurrences. The present accordingly is conative or continuous or iterative: Mt 6^2 *ὅταν ποιῇς ἐλεημοσύνην* "whenever thou *art for doing* alms," 6^{16} *ὅταν νηστεύητε* "whenever ye *are fasting*," Jn 2^5 *ὅτι ἂν λέγῃ* "whatever he *says* (from time to time)." The aorist, being future by virtue of its mood, punctiliar by its tense, and consequently describing complete action, gets a future-perfect sense in this class of sentence; and it will be found most important to note this before we admit the less rigid translation. Thus Mt 5^{21} *ὃς ἂν φονεύσῃ* "the man who *has* committed murder," 5^{47} *ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε* "if you *have* only saluted," Mk 9^{18} *ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ* "wherever it *has* seized him:" the cast of the sentence allows us to abbreviate the future-perfect in these cases. Mt 5^{31} at first sight raises some difficulty, but *ἀπολύσῃ* denotes not so much the carrying into effect as the determination. We may quote a passage from the *Meidias* of Demosthenes (p. 525) which exhibits the difference of present and aorist in this connexion very neatly: *χρὴ δὲ ὅταν μὲν τιθῆσθε τοὺς νόμους ὁποῖοί τινές εἰσιν σκοπεῖν, ἐπειδὰν δὲ θῆσθε, φυλάττειν καὶ χρῆσθαι*—*τιθῆσθε* applies to *bills*, *θῆσθε* to *acts*.

The part which the Subjunctive plays in the scheme of the Conditional Sentences demands a few lines here, though

Conditional Sentences, Simple, General and Future.

any systematic treatment of this large subject must be left for our second volume. The difference between εἰ and ἐάν has been considerably lessened in Hellenistic as compared with earlier Greek. We have seen that ἐάν can even take the indicative; while (as rarely in classical Greek) εἰ can be found with the subjunctive. The latter occurs only in 1 Co 14^5, where the peculiar phrase accounts for it: cf the inscription cited by Deissmann (*BS* 118), ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐὰν[1] . . . θελήσῃ. We should hardly care to build much on Rev 11^5. In Lk 9^{13} and Phil $3^{11f.}$ we probably have deliberative subjunctive, "unless we are to go and buy," "if after all I am to attain . . . to apprehend." The subjunctive with εἰ is rare in early papyri: cf OP 496 (ii/A.D.) εἰ δὲ ἦν (= ᾖ) ὁ γαμῶν πρότερος τετελευτηκώς, ἐχέτω κτλ. The differentiation of construction remains at present stereotyped: εἰ goes with indicative, is used exclusively when past tenses come in (*e.g.* Mk 3^{26}), and uses οὐ as its negative; while ἐάν, retaining μή exclusively, takes the subjunctive almost invariably, unless the practically synonymous future indicative is used. Ἐάν and εἰ are both used, however, to express future conditions. This is not only the case with εἰ c. fut.—in which the NT does not preserve the "minatory or monitory" connotation[2] which Gildersleeve discovered for classical Greek—but even with εἰ c. pres. in such documents as BU 326, quoted above, p. 59. The immense majority of conditional sentences in the NT belong to these heads. We deal with the unfulfilled condition below, pp. 200 f., and with the relics of εἰ c. opt., p. 196.

Some Uses of the Negatives:— Οὐ μή.

Leaving the Dependent Clauses for subsequent treatment, let us turn now to some aspects of the negative μή, mainly though not exclusively concerning the Subjunctive. Into the vexed question of the origin of the οὐ μή construction we must not enter with any detail. The classical discussion of it in Goodwin *MT* 389 ff. leaves some very serious difficulties, though it has advanced our knowledge. Goodwin's insistence that denial and prohibition must be dealt with together touches a weak spot in Prof. Sonnenschein's otherwise very attractive account of the prohibitory use, in a paper already quoted (*CR* xvi 165 ff.). Sonnenschein would make *οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃς* the interrogative of the prohibition *μὴ ποιήσῃς*, "won't you abstain from doing?" Similarly in Latin *quin noli facere?* is "why not refuse to do?" The theory is greatly weakened by its having no obvious application to denial. Gildersleeve (*AJP* iii. 202 ff.) suggests that the *οὐ* may be separate: *οὔ· μὴ σκώψῃς = no! don't jeer, οὔ· μὴ γένηται = no! let it never be!*[a] Brugmann (*Gram.*³ 502) practically follows Goodwin, whom he does not name. We start from *μή* in cautious assertion, to which we must return presently: *μὴ γένηται = it may perchance happen, μὴ σκώψῃς = you will perhaps jeer, μὴ ἐρεῖς τοῦτο = you will perhaps say this.* Then the *οὐ* negatives the whole, so that *οὐ μή* becomes, as Brugmann says, "certainly not." *Non nostrum est tantas componere lites:* these questions go back upon origins, and we are dealing with the language in a late development, in which it is antecedently possible enough that the rationale of the usage may have been totally obscured.

---

[1] Cf above (p. 169), on εἰ μήτι ἄν.

[2] But 1 Co $3^{14f.}$: cf Hb P 59 (iii/B.C.).

The use of *οὐ μή* in the Greek Bible calls for special comment, and we may take for our text some remarks of Gildersleeve's from the brief article just cited. "This emphatic form of negative (*οὐ μή*) is far more common in the LXX and the NT than it is in the classic Greek. This tendency to exaggeration in the use of an adopted language is natural." And again, "The combination has evidently worked its way up from familiar language. So it occurs in the mouth of the Scythian archer, Ar. *Thesmoph.* 1108 *οὐκὶ μὴ λαλῆσι σύ;*" Our previous inquiries have prepared us for some modifications of this statement. "*The* NT" is not a phrase we can allow; nor will "adopted language" pass muster without qualification. In *Exp T* xiv. 429 n. the writer ventured on a preliminary note suggested by NP 51, a Christian letter about coeval with ℵ and B, in which Mt 10⁴² or Mk 9⁴¹ is loosely cited from memory and *οὐκ ἀπολλῖ* (*sic*) substituted for *οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ*. Cf *Didache* 15 quoting Mt 5²⁶. *Οὐ μή* is rare, and very emphatic, in the non-literary papyri. On the other hand, we find it 13 times in OT citations in NT, and abundantly in the

[a] See p. 249.

Gospels, almost exclusively in *Logia.* In all of these we have certain or probable Semitic originals. Apart from these, and the special case of Rev, it occurs only four times in Paul and once in 2 Pet. It will be seen therefore that if "translation Greek" is put aside, we have no difference between papyri and NT. Paul's few exx. are eminently capable of bearing emphasis in the classical manner. The frequency of *οὐ μή* in Rev may partly be accounted for by recalling the extent to which Semitic material probably underlies the Book; but the unlettered character of most of the papyrus quotations, coupled with Gildersleeve's remark on Aristophanes' Scythian, suggests that elementary Greek culture may be partially responsible here, as in the rough translations on which Mt and Lk had to work for their reproduction of the words of Jesus. The question then arises whether in places outside the free Greek of Paul we are to regard *οὐ μή* as bearing any special emphasis. The analysis of W. G. Ballantine (*AJP* xviii. 453 ff.), seems to show that it is impossible to assert this. In the LXX, לֹא is translated *οὐ* or *οὐ μή* indifferently within a single verse, as in Is 5^{27}. The Revisers have made it emphatic in a good many passages in which the AV had an ordinary negative; but they have left over fifty places unaltered, and do not seem to have discovered any general principle to guide their decision. Prof. Ballantine seems to be justified in claiming (1) that it is not natural for a form of special emphasis to be used in the majority of places where a negative prediction occurs, and (2) that in relative clauses, and questions which amount to positive assertions, an emphatic negative is wholly out of place: he instances Mk 13^2 and Jn 18^{11}—Mt 25^9 is decidedly more striking. In commenting on this article, Gildersleeve cites other examples of the "blunting . . . of pointed idioms in the transfer from classic Greek": he mentions the disproportionate use of "the more pungent aorist" as against the "quieter present imperative"—the tendency of Josephus to "overdo the participle"—the conspicuous appearance in narrative of the "articular infinitive, which belongs to argument." So here, he says, "the stress" of *οὐ μή* "has been lost by over-familiarity." One is inclined to call in the survival among uneducated people of the older English double negatives—"He didn't say nothing to nobody," and the like—which resemble οὐ μή in so far as they are old forms preserved by the unlearned, mainly perhaps because they give the emphasis that is beloved, in season and out of season, by people whose style lacks restraint. But this parallel does not take us very far, and in particular does not illustrate the fact that οὐ μή was capable of being used by a cultured writer like Paul with its full classical emphasis.[1]

Let us now tabulate NT statistics. In WH *text*, οὐ μή occurs in all 96 times. Of these 71 exx. are with aor. subj.; in 2, the verb is ambiguous, ending in -ω; and 15 more, ending in -εις (-ει) or -ῃς (-ῃ), might be regarded as equally indeterminate, as far as the evidence of the MSS readings is concerned. There remain 8 futures. Four of these—Mt 16^{22} ἔσται, with Lk 21^{33} and Rev 9^6 18^{14} (see below)—are unambiguous: the rest only involve the change of ο to ω, or at worst that of ου to ω, to make them aor. subj. The passages are:—Mt 26^{35} (-σομαι ℵBCD) = Mk 14^{31} (-σομαι ABCD, against ℵ and the mob). (The attestation in Mt is a strong confirmation of the future for the Petrine tradition in its earliest Greek form.) Lk 21^{33} (-σονται ℵBDL) answers to the Marcan οὐ παρελεύσονται (13^{31} BD: the insertion of μή by ℵACL etc. means a mere assimilation to Lk), while Mt has οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν (24^{35}): it is at least possible that our Lucan text is only a fusion of Mk and Mt. In Jn 10^5 ABD *al.* support ἀκολουθήσουσιν. In Heb 10^{17} (from LXX) we have the μνησθήσομαι of ℵACD 17 and the Oxyrhynchus papyrus emended to μνησθῶ (following the LXX) in correctors of ℵ and D and all the later MSS. There remains εὑρήσουσιν in Rev 9^6 (AP εὕρωσιν, against ℵB_2) 18^{14}. We need not hesitate to accept the future as a possible, though moribund, construction: the later MSS in trying to get rid of it bear witness to the levelling tendency. There is no apparent difference in meaning. We may pass on to note the distribution of *οὐ μή* in NT. It occurs 13 times in LXX citations. Apart from these, there are no exx. in Ac, Heb, or the "General Epp", except 2 Pet 1^{10}. Rev has it 16 times. Paul's use is limited to 1 Th 4^{15} (*v. infr.*) 5^{3}, 1 Co 8^{13}, Gal 5^{16}. Only 21 exx. in all come from these sources, leaving 64 for the Gospels. Of the latter 57 are from actual words of Christ (Mt 17, Mk 8 [Mk] 1, Lk 17, Jn 14): of the remaining 7, Mt 16^{22} and 26^{35} (= Mk 14^{31}), Jn 13^{8} 20^{25} have most obvious emphasis, and so may Lk 1^{15} (from the special nativity-source[1]) and Jn 11^{56}. That the locution was very much at home in translations, and unfamiliar in original Greek, is by this time abundantly clear. But we may attempt a further analysis, by way of contribution to the minutiæ of the Synoptic problem. If we go through the exx. of *οὐ μή* in Mk, we find that Mt has faithfully taken over every one, 8 in all. Lk has 5 of these logia, once (Mk 13^{2} = Lk 21^{6}) dropping the *μή*. Mt introduces *οὐ μή* into Mk 7^{12}, and Lk into Mk 4^{22} and 10^{29}, both Mt and Lk into Mk 13^{31} (see above).[2] Turning to "Q", so far as we can deduce it from logia common to Mt and Lk, we find only two places (Mt 5^{26} = Lk 12^{59}, Mt 23^{39} = Lk 13^{35}) in which the evangelists agree in using *οὐ μή*. Mt uses it in 5^{18} (Lk 21^{33} has a certain resemblance, but 16^{17} is the parallel), and Lk in 6^{37} *bis* (contrast Mt 7^{1}). Finally, in the logia peculiar to Mt or Lk, the presence of which in "Q" is therefore a matter of speculation, we find *οὐ μή* 4 times in Mt and 7 in Lk. When the testimony of Jn is added, we see that this negative is impartially distributed over all our sources for the words of Christ, without special prominence in any one evangelist or any one of the documents which they seem to have used. Going outside the Gospels, we find *οὐ μή* in the fragment of Aristion (?) ([Mk] 16^{18}); in 1 Th 4^{15} (regarded by Ropes, *DB* v. 345, as an Agraphon); and in the Oxyrhynchus "Sayings"—no. 2 of the first series, and the preface of the second. The coincidence of all these separate witnesses certainly is suggestive. Moreover in Rev, the only NT Book outside the Gospels which has οὐ μή with any frequency, 4 exx. are from the Epp. to the Churches, where Christ is speaker; and all of the rest, except 18[14] (which is very emphatic), are strongly reminiscent of the OT, though not according to the LXX except in 18[22] (=Ezek 26[13]). It follows that οὐ μή is quite as rare in the NT as it is in the papyri, when we have put aside (*a*) passages coming from the OT, and (*b*) sayings of Christ, these two classes accounting for nearly 90 per cent. of the whole. Since these are just the two elements which made up "Scripture" in the first age of Christianity, one is tempted to put it down to the same cause in both—a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a peculiarly decisive tone.

---

[1] Winer (p. 634) refers to "the prevailing opinion of philologers" in his own time (and later), that οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃς originates in an ellipsis—"no *fear* that he will do it." It is advisable therefore to note that this view has been abandoned by modern philology. To give full reasons would detain us too long. But it may be observed that the dropping out of the vital word for *fearing* needs explanation, which has not been forthcoming; while the theory, suiting *denials* well enough, gives no natural account of *prohibitions*.

---

[1] It comes from the LXX of 1 Sam 1^{11}, if A is right there, with πίεται changed to the aor. subj. But A of course may show a reading conformed to the NT.

[2] As to Mk 4^{22}, note that in the doublet from "Q" neither Mt (10^{26}) nor Lk (12^{2}) has *οὐ μή*: the new Oxyrhynchus "Saying," no. 4, has also simple *οὐ*.

Μή in Cautious Assertions.

In connexion with this use of negatives, we may well pursue here the later developments of that construction of μή from which the use of οὐ μή originally sprang, according to the theory that for the present holds the field. It is obvious, whatever be its antecedent history, that μή is often equivalent to our "perhaps." A well-known sentence from Plato's *Apology* will illustrate it as well as anything: Socrates says (p. 39A) ἀλλὰ μὴ οὐ τοῦτ' ᾖ χαλεπόν, θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν, "perhaps it is not this which is hard, to escape death." This is exactly like Mt 25[9] as it stands in ℵALZ: the οὐ μή which replaces οὐ in BCD does not affect the principle. The subjunctive has its futuristic sense, it would seem, and starts most naturally in Greek from the use of μή in questions: how this developed from the original use of μή in prohibition (whence comes the final sentence), and how far we are to call in the sentences of fearing, which are certainly not widely separable, it would not be relevant for us to discuss in this treatise. Μὴ τοῦτ' ᾖ χαλεπόν, if originally a question, meant "will this possibly be difficult?" So in the indicative, as Plato *Protag.* 312A ἀλλ' ἄρα μὴ οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνεις, "but perhaps then you do not suppose" (Riddell 140). We have both these forms abundantly before us in the NT:—thus Lk 11[35] σκόπει μὴ τὸ φῶς . . . σκότος ἐστίν, "Look! perhaps the light . . . is darkness"; Col 2[8] βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν, "Take heed! perhaps there will be someone who

. . ." (cf Heb 3^{12}); Gal 4^{11} φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα, "I am afraid about you: perhaps I have toiled in vain." So in the papyri, as Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) ἀγωνιῶ μήποτε ἀρρωστεῖ τὸ παιδάριον, NP 17 (iii/A.D.) ὑφωροῦμε . . . μὴ ἄρα ἐνθρώσκων ἔλαθεν ὕδατι, "I suspect he may have jumped into the water unnoticed": so Tb P 333 (216 A.D.) ὑφορῶμαι οὖν μὴ ἔπαθάν τι ἀνθρώπινον. In all these cases the prohibitive force of μή is more or less latent, producing a strong deprecatory tone, just as in a direct question μή either demands the answer *No* (as Mt 7^{9} etc.), or puts a suggestion in the most tentative and hesitating way (Jn 4^{29}). The fineness of the distinction between this category and the purpose clause may be illustrated by 2 Co 2^{7}, where the paratactic original might equally well be "Perhaps he will be overwhelmed" or "Let him not be overwhelmed." In Gal 2^{2} the purpose clause (if such it be), goes back to the former type—"Can it be that I am running, or ran, in vain?"[1] So 1 Th 3^{5}. The warning of Ac 5^{39} might similarly start from either "Perhaps you will be found," or "Do not be found": the former suits the ποτέ better. It will be seen that the uses in question have mostly become hypotactic, but that no real change in the tone of the sentence is introduced by the governing word. The case is the same as with prohibitions introduced by ὅρα, βλέπετε, προσέχετε, etc.: see above, p. 124. One very difficult case under this head should be mentioned here, that of 2 Tim 2^{25}. We have already (p. 55) expressed the conviction that δωη is really δώῃ, subjunctive. Not only would the optative clash with ἀνανήψωσιν, but it cannot be justified in itself by any clear syntactic rule. The difficulty felt by WH (*App*^{2} 175), that "its use for two different moods in the same Epistle would be strange," really comes to very little; and the survival of the epic δώῃ is better supported than they suggest. There is an apparent case of γνώῃ subj. in Clement *Paed.* iii. 1, ἑαυτὸν γάρ τις ἐὰν γνώῃ, θεὸν εἴσεται. A respectable number of quotations for δώῃ is given from early Christian literature in Reinhold 90 f. Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 429 456) may fairly be called as evidence not only for the Hellenistic δῴη and διδῴη (which he and his editor regard as "utterly ridiculous") but for the feeling that there is a subjunctive δώῃ, though he only quotes Homer. But we must not press this, only citing from Rutherford the statement that some MSS read "δῴη" for δῷ in Plato *Gorg.* 481A, where the optative would be most obviously out of place. If we read the opt. in 2 Tim *l.c.*, we can only assume that the writer misused an obsolete idiom, correctly used in Lk 3^{15} in past sequence. Against this stands the absence of evidence that Paul (or the *auctor ad Timotheum*, if the critics demur) concerned himself with literary archaisms, like his friends the authors of Lk, Ac, and Heb. Taking δώῃ and ἀνανήψωσιν together, we make the μήποτε introduce a hesitating question, "to try whether haply God may give": cf the well-known idiom with εἰ,[1] "to see if," as in Ac 27^{12}, Rom 1^{10}, Lk 14^{28}, Phil $3^{11f.}$. See in favour of δώῃ the careful note in WS 120, also Blass 50.[2]

---

[1] Τρέχω would be subjunctive, since the sentence as it stands is felt as final. This interpretation as a whole has to reckon with the alternative rendering, "Am I running (said I), or have I run, in vain?"—a decidedly simpler and more probable view: see Findlay in *Exp B* p. 104; *Thess.* (in *CGT*) p. 69.

The Optative:—
Optative Proper;

We take next the Optative, which makes so poor a figure in the NT that we are tempted to hurry on. In MGr its only relic[3] is the phrase μὴ γένοιτο, which appears in Lk 20^{16} and 14 times in Rom (10), 1 Co (1) and Gal (3). This is of course the Optative proper, distinguished by the absence of ἄν and the presence (if negative) of μή. Burton (*MT* 79) cites 35[4] proper optatives from the NT, which come down to

---

[1] Note OP 743 ὅλος διαπονοῦμαι εἰ Ἕ. χαλκοῦς ἀπόλεσεν, where Witkowski says (p. 57) "idem quod frequentius ἀγωνιῶ μή." *Aliter* G. and H.

[2] Unfortunately we cannot call the LXX in aid: there are a good many exx. of δῴη, but they all seem optative. Τίς δῴη . . . ; in Num 11^{29}, Judg 9^{29}, 2 Sam 18^{33}, Job 31^{35}, Ca 8^{1}, Jer 9^{2}, might well seem deliberative subj., but Ps 120(119)^{3} τί δοθείη σοι καὶ τί προστεθείη σοι ; is unfortunately quite free from ambiguity. We may regard these as real wishes thrown into the interrogative form. The LXX use of the optative looks a promising subject for Mr Thackeray's much-needed Grammar. We will only observe here that in Num *l.c.* the Hebrew has the simple imperf.—also that A has a tendency to change opt. into subj. (as Ruth 1^{9} δῷ . . . εὕρητε), which accords with the faint distinction between them. In Dt $28^{24ff.}$ we have opt. and fut. indic. alternating, with same Hebrew. A more surprising fusion still—worse than 2 Tim *l.c.* with δῴη—is seen in 2 Mac 9^{24} ἐάν τι παράδοξον ἀποβαίη καὶ προσαπέλθῃ.

[3] But see p. 240.

[4] Read 38: I correct the remaining figures.

23 when we drop *μὴ γένοιτο*. Of these Paul claims 15 (Rom $15^{5.\,13}$, Philem ^{20}, 2 Tim $1^{16.\,18}$ 4^{16}, the rest in 1 and 2 Th), while Mk, Lk, Ac, Heb, 1 Pet and 2 Pet have one apiece, and Jude two. *Ὀναίμην* in Philem ^{20} is the only proper optative in the NT which is not 3rd person.[1] Note that though the use is rare it is well distributed: even Mk has it (p. 179), and Lk 1^{38} and Ac 8^{20} come from the Palestinian stratum of Luke's writing. We may bring in here a comparison from our own language, which will help us for the Hellenistic optative as a whole.[2] The optative *be* still keeps a real though diminishing place in our educated colloquial: "be it so" or "so be it," is preserved as a formula, like *μὴ γένοιτο*, but "Be it my only wisdom here" is felt as a poetical archaism. So in the application of the optative to hypothesis, we should not generally copy "Be it never so humble," or "If she be not fair to me": on the other hand, "If I *were* you" is the only correct form. "God bless you!" "Come what may," "I wish I were at home," are further examples of optatives still surviving. But a somewhat archaic style is recognisable in

> "Were the whole realm of nature mine,
> That were a present far too small."

We shall see later that a Hellenist would equally avoid in colloquial speech a construction like

> *εἰ καὶ τὰ πάντ᾽ ἔμ᾽ εἴη,*
> *τὰ πάντα μοι γένοιτ᾽ ἂν*
> *ἔλασσον ἢ ὥστε δοῦναι.*

The Hellenist used the optative in wishes and prayers very much as we use our subjunctive. It is at home in formulæ, as in oaths *passim*: *εὐορκοῦντι μέμ μοι εὖ εἴη, ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία* (OP 240—i/A.D.), *ἢ ἔνοχοι εἴημεν τῶι ὅρκωι* (OP 715—ii/A.D.), . . . *παραδώσω* . . . *ἢ ἐνσχεθείην τῷ ὅρκῳ* (BM 301—ii/A.D.), etc. But it is also in free use, as OP 526 (ii/A.D.) *χαίροις, Καλόκαιρε*, LP*b* (ii/B.C.) *ὃς διδοίη σοι*, LP*w* (ii/iii A.D.), *μηδείς με καταβιάσαιτο* and *εἰσέλθοις καὶ ποιήσαις*,

---

[1] Some support for the persistence of this optative in the Κοινή may be found in its appearance in a curse of iii/B.C., coming from the Tauric Chersonese, and showing two Ionic forms (Audollent 144, no. 92).

[2] Cf Sweet, *New English Grammar: Syntax* 107 ff.

BU 741 (ii/A.D.) ὃ μὴ γείνοιτο, BM 21 (ii/B.C.) σοὶ δὲ γένοιτο εὐημερεῖν, *BCH* 1902, p. 217, κεχολωμένον ἔχοιτο Μῆνα καταχθόνιον, Hl P 6 (iii/iv A.D.) ἐρρωμένον σε ἡ θία πρόνοια φυλάξαι. In hypotaxis the optative of wish appears in

in Hypothesis, clauses with εἰ, as is shown by the negative's being μή, as well as by the fact that we can add εἰ, *si*, *if*, to a wish, or express a hypothesis without a conjunction, by a clause of jussive or optative character. Εἰ with the optative in the NT occurs in 11 passages, of which 4 must be put aside as indirect questions and accordingly falling under the next head. The three exx. in Ac are all in *or. obl.*: 20^{16} ("I want if I can to . . ."), and 27^{39} ("We will beach her if we can"), are future conditions; and 24^{19} puts into the past (unfulfilled) form the assertion "They ought to bring their accusation, if they have any" (ἔχουσι). The remainder include εἰ τύχοι in 1 Co 14^{10} 15^{37}, the only exx. in Paul, and two in 1 Pet, εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε 3^{14} and εἰ θέλοι 3^{17}. The examination of these we may defer till we take up Conditional Sentences together. We only note here that HR give no more than 13 exx. from LXX of εἰ c. opt. (apart from 4 Mac and one passage omitted in uncials): about 2 of these are wishes, and 5 are cases of ὥσ(περ) εἴ τις, while 2 seem to be direct or indirect questions. Neither in LXX nor in NT is there an ex. of εἰ c. opt. answered with opt. c. ἄν, nor has one been quoted from the papyri.[1] To the optative proper belongs also that after final particles, as we infer from the negative μή and from its being an alternative for the (jussive) subjunctive. It does not however call for any treatment in a NT grammar.

in Final clauses. We have seen already (p. 55) that ἵνα δοῖ and ἵνα γνοῖ are unmistakably subjunctives: if ἵνα δῴη be read (*ib.* and pp. 193 f.) in Eph 1^{17} it will have to be a virtual *wish* clause, ἵνα serving merely to link it to the previous verb; but δώῃ is preferable. This banishment of the final optative only means that the NT writers were averse to bringing in a construction which was artificial, though not quite obsolete. The obsolescence of the optative had progressed since the time of the LXX, and we will only compare the writers and papyri of i/A.D. and ii/A.D. Diel in his program *De enuntiatis finalibus*, pp. 20 f., gives Josephus (i/A.D.) 32 per cent. of optatives after *ἵνα, ὅπως* and *ὡς*, Plutarch *Lives* (i/A.D.) 49, Arrian (ii/A.D.) 82, and Appian (ii/A.D.) 87, while Herodian (iii/A.D.) has 75. It is very clear that the final optative was the hall-mark of a pretty Attic style. The Atticisers were not particular however to restrict the optative to past sequence, as any random dip into Lucian himself will show. We may contrast the more natural Polybius (ii/B.C.), whose percentage of optatives is only 7,[1] or Diodorus (i/B.C.), who falls to 5. The writer of 4 Mac (i/A.D.) outdoes all his predecessors with 71, so that we can see the *cacoethes Atticissandi* affecting Jew as well as Gentile. The papyri of our period only give a single optative, so far as I have observed: OP 237 (late ii/A.D.) *ἵνα . . . δυνηθείην.* A little later we have LP*w* (ii/iii A.D.) *ἵν' εὔοδον ἄρτι μοι εἴηι*, in *primary* sequence; and before long, in the Byzantine age, there is a riot of optatives, after *ἐάν* or anything else. The deadness of the construction even in the Ptolemaic period may be well shown from TP 1 (ii/B.C.) *ἠξίωσα ἵνα χρηματισθήσοιτο*—future optative! Perhaps these facts and citations will suffice to show why the NT does not attempt to rival the *littérateurs* in the use of this resuscitated elegance.

---

[1] Meanwhile we may observe that Blass's dictum (p. 213) that the εἰ c. opt. form is used "if I wish to represent anything as generally possible, without regard to the general or actual situation at the moment," suits the NT exx. well; and it seems to fit the general facts better than Goodwin's doctrine of a "less vivid future" condition (Goodwin, *Greek Gram.* 301).

Potential Optative.

We turn to the other main division of the Optative, that of which *οὐ* and *ἄν* are frequent attendants. With *ἄν* the Potential answers to our own *I should, you* or *he would*, generally following a condition. It was used to express a future in a milder form, and to express a request in deferential style. But it is unnecessary to dwell upon this here, for the table given above (p. 166) shows that it was no longer a really living form in NT times. It was literary, but not artificial, as Luke's use proves. It figures 30 times in LXX, or 19 times when 4 Mac is excluded, and its occurrences are tolerably well distributed and not abnormal in form. We should note however the omission of ἄν, which was previously cited in one phrase (p. 194 n.).[1] We shall see that ἄν tends to be dropped with the indicative; the general weakening of the particle is probably responsible for its omission with the optative as well. *Τίς ἂν δῴη*, Job 31^{31} *al*, does not differ from *τίς δῴη* elsewhere; and no distinction of meaning is conveyed by such an omission as appears in 4 Mac 5^{13} *συγγνωμονήσειεν*, "even if there is (*ἐστί*) [a God], he would forgive." In other ways we become aware how little difference ἄν makes in this age of its senescence. Thus in Par P 35 (ii/B.C.) *ἐξήνεγκεν ὁπόσ' ἂν ἐρευν[ῷ]το*,[2] the dropping of ἄν would affect the meaning hardly at all, the contingent force being practically *nil*. So when Luke says in 1^{62} *ἐνένευον . . . τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι* "how he would like,"—cf Ac 10^{17}, Lk 15^{26} 18^{36} (D) 9^{46},—there is a minimum of difference as compared with Ac 21^{33} *ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη* "who he might be," or Lk 18^{36} ℵAB *τί εἴη τοῦτο*. Not that ἂν c. opt. in an indirect question is always as near as in this case to the unaccompanied optative which we treat next. Thus in the inscr. *Magn.* 215 (i/A.D.) *ἐπερωτᾷ . . . τί αὐτῷ σημαίνει ἢ τί ἂν ποιήσας ἀδεῶς διατελοίη* represents the conditional sentence, "If I were to do what, should I be secure?" *i.e.* "what must I do that I may . . .?" So in Lk 6^{11} *τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν* is the hesitating substitute for the direct *τί ποιήσομεν*; Ac 5^{24} *τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο* answers to "What *will* this come to?" Cf Esth 13^{3} *πυθομένου . . . πῶς ἂν ἀχθείη . . .* "how this might be brought to pass" (RV). In direct question we have Ac 17^{18} *τί ἂν θέλοι . . . λέγειν*; The idiomatic opt. c. ἄν in a softened assertion meets us in Ac 26^{29} ℵ^{c}AB, *εὐξαίμην ἄν* "I could pray." Among all the exx. of ἄν c. opt. in Luke there is only one which has a protasis, Ac 8^{31} *πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην, ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσει με*;—a familiar case of future condition with the less vivid form in the apodosis.[1] No more need be said of this use; nor need we add much about the other use of the Potential, that seen in indirect questions. The tendency of Greek has been exactly opposite to that of Latin, which by the classical period had made the optative ("subjunctive") *de rigueur* in indirect questions, whatever the tense of the main verb. Greek never admitted *τίς εἴην* = *quis sim* into primary sequence, and even after past tenses the optative was a refinement which Hellenistic vernacular made small effort to preserve. On Luke's occasional use of it we need not tarry, unless it be to repeat Winer's remark (p. 375) on Ac 21^{33}, where the opt. is appropriate in asking about the unknown, while the accompanying indicative, "what he has done," suits the conviction that the prisoner had committed *some* crime. The tone of remoteness and uncertainty given by the optative is well seen in such a reported question as Lk 3^{15} *μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ Χριστός*, or 22^{23} *τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη . . . ὁ ταῦτα μέλλων πράσσειν.* It will be noted that Luke observes the rule of sequence, as he does in the use of *πρίν* (p. 169).[2]

---

[1] See Kälker's observations, *Quæst.* 288 f.

---

[1] Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) has a dropped ἄν in a place where it is needed badly: *ἄλλα μὲν οὐθένα ἐπείπαιμι πλὴν ὅτι ἕλκεσθαι βεβούλευται.* But I would read *οὐθὲν ἅ<ν>*—if one may conjecture without seeing the papyrus. (So Mahaffy now reads: he also substitutes *ἀλλὰ*, and *κακῶς* for *ἕλκεσθαι*.)

[2] It is unfortunate that this crucial ῷ is missing, for *ἐρευνᾶτο* (an unaugmented form) is quite possible, though less likely. The papyrus has another optative, in indirect question, *εἴησαν εἰσπορευσάμενοι.*

"Unreal" Indicative.

The Indicative—apart from its Future, which we have seen was originally a subjunctive in the main—is suited by its whole character only to positive and negative statements, and not to the expression of contingencies, wishes, commands, or other subjective conceptions. We are not concerned here with the forces which produced what is called the "unreal" use of the indicative, since Hellenistic Greek received it from the earlier age as a fully grown and normal usage, which it proceeded to limit in sundry directions. Its most prominent use is in the two parts of the unfulfilled conditional statement. We must take this up among the other Conditional Sentences, in vol. ii., only dealing here with that which affects the study of the indicative as a *modus irrealis.* This includes the cases of omitted *ἄν*,[1] and those of *οὐ* instead of *μή*. It happens that the only NT example of the latter has the former characteristic as well: Mk 14^{21} (= Mt 26^{24}) *καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη*—Mt improves the Greek by adding *ἦν*. It is only the ultimate sense which makes this "unreal" at all: as far as form goes, the protasis is like Heb 12^{25} *εἰ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον*, "if they failed to escape" (as they did). There, "it was a warning to us" might have formed the apodosis, and so that sentence and this would have been grammatically similar. We might speak thus of some villain of tragedy, *e.g.* "A good thing if (nearly = that) there never was such a man." Transferred as it is to a man who is actually present, the saying gains in poignancy by the absence of the contingent form. *Εἰ οὐ* occurs fairly often with the indicative, but elsewhere always in simple conditions: see above, p. 171. The dropping of *ἄν* in the apodosis of unfulfilled conditions was classical with phrases like *ἔδει, ἐχρῆν, καλὸν ἦν.* Such sentences as "If he did it, it was the right thing," may be regarded as the starting-point of the use of the indicative in unfulfilled condition, since usage can easily supply the connotation "but he did not do it." The addition of *ἄν* to an indicative apodosis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicising "if": "*if* he had anything, he gave it," or "if he had anything, in that case (*ἄν*) he gave it," alike suggest by their emphasis that the condition was not realised. We further note the familiar fact that the imperfect in all "unreal" indicatives generally denotes present time:[2] cf the use with *ὄφελον* in Rev 3^{15} and 2 Co 11^{1}. (These are the sole NT examples of this kind of unreal indicative. The sentences of unrealised wish resemble those of unfulfilled condition further in using the aorist (1 Co 4^{8}) in reference to past time; but this could hardly have been otherwise.[1]) The difference of time in the real and unreal imperfect will be seen when we drop the ἄν in the stock sentence εἴ τι εἶχον, ἐδίδουν ἄν, "if I had anything (*now*), I should give it," which by eliminating the ἄν becomes "if (*i.e.* whenever) I had anything, I used to give it." Goodwin (*MT* § 399, 410 ff.) shows that this use of the imperf. for present time is post-Homeric, and that it is not invariable in Attic—see his exx. For the NT we may cite Mt 23^{30} 24^{43} (ᾔδει) = Lk 12^{39}, Jn 4^{10} $11^{21. 32}$, 1 Jn 2^{19} as places where εἰ with imperf. decidedly denotes a *past* condition; but since all these exx. contain either ἤμην or ᾔδειν, which have no aorist, they prove nothing as to the survival of the classical ambiguity—we have to decide by the context here, as in all cases in the older literature, as to whether present or past time is meant. The distribution of tenses in the apodosis (when ἄν is present) may be seen in the table on p. 166. The solitary pluperf. is in 1 Jn 2^{19}. It need only be added that these sentences of unfulfilled condition state nothing necessarily unreal in their apodosis: it is of course usually the case that the statement is untrue, but the sentence itself only makes it untrue "under the circumstances" (ἄν), since the condition is unsatisfied. The time of the apodosis generally determines itself, the imperfect regularly denoting present action, except in Mt 23^{30} (ἤμεθα).

---

[1] It is sentences of this kind to which Goodwin's "less vivid form" does apply: his extension of this to be the rule for the whole class I should venture to dissent from—see above, p. **196 n.**

[2] On the general question of the obsolescence of the optative, reference may be made to F. G. Allinson's paper in *Gildersleeve Studies* 353 ff., where itacism is alleged to be a contributory cause. Cf OP 60 (iv/A.D.) *ἵν' οὖν ἔχοιτε . . . καὶ καταστήσηται* (= -ε), where *ἔχητε* is meant; OP 71 (*ib*) where *εἰ σοὶ δοκοῖ* is similarly a misspelt subj. (or indic.). When *οι* had become the complete equivalent of *η*, *ῃ*, *ει*, and *αι* of *ε*, the optative forms could no longer preserve phonetic distinctness. Prof. Thumb dissents: see p. 240.

---

[1] Cf OP 526 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀνέβενε, ἐγὼ τὸν λόγον μου οὐ παρέβενον*, OP 530 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ πλεῖον δέ μοι παρέκειτο, πάλιν σοι ἀπεστάλκειν*, Rein P 7 (ii/B.C.) *οὐκ ἀπέστηι εἰ μὴ ἠνάγκασε σεσημειῶσθαι . . . συγγραφήν*, *al.*

[2] In Lk 17^{6} note *present* in protasis. Cf Par P 47 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 64) *ἰ μὴ μικρόν τι ἐντρέπομαι, οὐκ ἄν με ἴδες*, "but for the fact that I am."

Unrealised *purpose* makes a minute addition to the tale of unreal indicatives in the NT. The afterthought ἔδραμον in Gal 2^{2}, with which stands 1 Th 3^{5}, has plenty of classical parallels (see Goodwin *MT* § 333), but no further exx. are found in NT writers, and (as we saw above, p. 193 n.) the former ex. is far from certain. Such sentences often depend on unfulfilled conditions with ἄν, and the decadence of these carries with it that of a still more subtle and less practical form of language.

---

[1] There is one ex. of ὄφελον c. fut., Gal 5^{12}, and there also the associations of the particle (as it now is) help to mark an expression never meant to be taken seriously. The dropping of augment in ὤφελον may be Ionic, as it is found in Herodotus; its application to 2nd or 3rd pers. is probably due to its being felt to mean "*I* would" instead of "thou shouldst," etc. Note among the late exx. in LS (p. 1099) that with με . . . ὀλέσθαι, a first step in this development. Grimm-Thayer gives LXX parallels. See also Schwyzer *Perg.* 173.

CHAPTER IX.

THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

Nominal Verbs and Verbal Nouns.

THE mention of "The Verb" has been omitted in the heading of this chapter, in deference to the susceptibilities of grammarians who wax warm when λύειν or λύσας is attached to the Verb instead of the Noun. But having thus done homage to orthodoxy, we proceed to treat these two categories almost exclusively as if they were mere verbal moods, as for most practical purposes they are. Every schoolboy knows that in origin and in part of their use they belong to the noun; but on this side they have been sufficiently treated in chapters iv. and v., and nearly all that is distinctive is verbal.

The Infinitive:—Its Origin.

The Greek Infinitive is historically either a locative (as λύειν) or a dative (as λῦσαι, εἶναι, etc.) from a noun base closely connected with a verb.[1] We can see this fact best from a glance at Latin, where *regere* is obviously the locative of a noun like *genus*, *rĕgī* the dative of a noun much like *rēx* except in quantity, and *rectum*, *-tuī*, *-tū* the accusative, dative, and locative, respectively, of an action-noun of the 4th declension. In Plautus we even find the abstract noun *tactio* in the nominative governing its case just as if it were *tangere*. Classical Greek has a few well-known exx. of a noun or adjective governing the case appropriate to the verb with which it is closely connected. Thus Plato *Apol.* 18B τὰ μετέωρα φροντιστής, Sophocles *Ant.* 789 σὲ φύξιμος: see Jebb's note. Vedic

---

[1] On the morphology of the Infinitive see Giles *Manual*² 468 ff. It should be noted that no syntactical difference survives in Greek between forms originally dative and those which started in the locative.

Sanskrit would show us yet more clearly that the so-called infinitive is nothing but a case—any case—of a noun which had enough verbal consciousness in it to "govern" an object. The isolation and stereotyping of a few of these forms produces the infinitive of Greek, Latin, or English. It will be easily seen in our own language that what we call the infinitive is only the dative of a noun: Middle English had a locative with *at*. In such a sentence as "He went out to work again," how shall we parse *work*? Make it "hard work," and the Noun claims it: substitute "work hard," and the Verb comes to its own. One clear inference from all this is that there was originally no *voice* for the infinitive. *Δυνατὸς θαυμάσαι*, "capable for wondering," and *ἄξιος θαυμάσαι*, "worthy for wondering," use the verbal noun in the same way; but one means "able to wonder," and the other "deserving to be wondered at." The middle and passive infinitives in Greek and Latin are merely adaptations of certain forms, out of a mass of units which had lost their individuality, to express a relation made prominent by the closer connexion of such nouns with the verb.

No voice distinction.

Survivals of Case force.

There are comparatively few uses of the Greek Infinitive in which we cannot still trace the construction by restoring the dative or locative case from whence it started. Indeed the very fact that when the form had become petrified the genius of the language took it up afresh and declined it by prefixing the article, shows us how persistent was the noun idea. The imperative use, the survival of which we have noticed above (pp. 179 f.), is instructive if we are right in interpreting it in close connexion with the origins of the infinitive. A dative of purpose used as an exclamation conveys at once the imperatival idea. The frequent identity of noun and verb forms in English enables us to cite in illustration two lines of a popular hymn:—

"So now to watch, to work, to war,
And then to rest for ever!"

A schoolmaster entering his classroom might say either "Now then, to work!" or "at work!"—dative or locative, expressing imperative 2nd person, as the hymn lines express 1st person. Among the NT exx., Phil 3^{16} has the 1st,[1] and the rest the 2nd person. The noun-case is equally traceable in many other uses of the infinitive. Thus the infinitive of purpose, as in Jn 21^{3} ἁλιεύειν *a-fishing*, or Mt 2^{2} προσκυνῆσαι *for worshipping*, —of consequence, as Heb 6^{10} ἐπιλαθέσθαι *to the extent of forgetting*,—and other "complementary" infinitives, as Heb 11^{15} καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι *opportunity for returning*, 2 Tim 1^{12} δυνατὸς φυλάξαι *competent for guarding*. The force of such infinitives is always best reached by thus going back to the original dative or locative noun.

Tenses.

From the account just given of the genesis of the infinitive it follows that it was originally destitute of *tense* as much as of voice. In classical Sanskrit the infinitive is formed without reference to the conjugation or conjugations in which a verb forms its present stem: thus √ *çru* (κλύω), inf. *çrotum*, pres. *çṛṇomi*—√ *yuj* (*iungo*), *yoktum*, *yunajmi*—√ *bhū* (φύω, *fui*, *be*), *bhavitum*, *bhavāmi*. We can see this almost as clearly in Latin, where action-nouns like *sonitum*, *positum*, *tactum* and *tactio*, etc., have no formal connexion with the present stem seen in *sonat*, *pōnit*, *tangit*. The σ in λῦσαι has only accidental similarity to link it with that in ἔλυσα. But when once these noun forms had established their close contact with the verb, accidental resemblances and other more or less capricious causes encouraged an association that rapidly grew, till all the tenses, as well as the three voices, were equipped with infinitives appropriated to their exclusive service. Greek had been supplied with the complete system from early times, and we need say nothing further on the subject here, since the infinitive presents no features which are not shared with other moods belonging to the several tenses.[2]

---

[1] Brugmann, *Gram.*³ 517 n., regards ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν as being for εἴπωμεν, and coming therefore under this head. It is a literary phrase, found only in Heb 7^{9}: cf the would-be literary papyrus, OP 67 (iv/A.D.). On this and other exx. of the "limitative infin." see Grünenwald in Schanz *Beiträge* II. iii. 22 ff., where it is shown to be generally used to qualify πᾶς or οὐδείς, and not as here.

[2] The Hellenistic weakening of the Future infinitive, which in the papyri is very frequently used for aorist or even present, would claim attention here if we were dealing with the Κοινή as a whole. See Kälker 281, Hatzidakis 190 f., 142 f. The NT hardly shows this form: apart from ἔσεσθαι, I

Infinitive of Purpose, etc. Some important questions arise from the free use in NT of the infinitive which is equivalent to *ἵνα* c. subj. In *ThLZ*, 1903, p. 421, Prof. Thumb has some suggestive remarks on this subject. He shows that this infinitive is decidedly more prominent in the ***Κοινή*** than in Attic, and is perhaps an Ionic element, as also may be the infin. with *τοῦ*, of which the same is true. In the Pontic dialect of MGr—as mentioned above, pp. 40 f.—the old infin. survives, while it vanished in favour of *νά* c. subj. in European MGr, where the infin. was less prominent in ancient times.[a] Now the use of the infin. in Pontic is restricted to certain syntactical sequences. To these belong verbs of movement, like *come, go up* (cf Lk 18^{10}, Par P 49—ii/B.C., = Witk. 29—*ἐὰν ἀναβῶ κἀγὼ προσκυνῆσαι*), *turn, go over, run, rise up, incline*, etc. The NT (and LXX) use generally agrees with this; and we find a similar correspondence with Pontic in the NT use of the infinitive after such verbs as *βούλομαι, ἐπιθυμῶ, σπουδάζω, πειράζω, ἐπιχειρῶ, αἰσχύνομαι, φοβοῦμαι, ἀξιῶ, παραινῶ, κελεύω, τάσσω, ἐῶ, ἐπιτρέπω, δύναμαι, ἔχω, ἄρχομαι.* With other verbs, as *παρακαλῶ*, the *ἵνα* construction prevails. This correspondence between ancient and modern vernacular in Asia Minor, Thumb suggests, is best explained by assuming two tendencies within the ***Κοινή***, one towards the universalising of *ἵνα*, the other towards the establishment of the old infinitive in a definite province: the former prevailed throughout the larger, western portion of Hellenism, and issued in the language of modern Hellas, where the infinitive is obsolete; while the latter held sway in the eastern territory, exemplifying itself as we should expect in the NT, and showing its characteristic in the dialect spoken to-day in the same country. Prof. Thumb does not pretend to urge more than the provisional acceptance of this theory, which indeed can only be decisively accepted or rejected when we have ransacked all the available inscriptions of Asia Minor for their evidence on the use of the infinitive. But it

---

can only cite He 3^{18}, Ac 26^{7} (WH mg). Jn 21^{2} has *χωρήσειν* (ℵBC), replaced by *χωρῆσαι* in the later MSS; but the future is wanted here. The aorist may be due to the loss of future meaning in *χωρήσειν* by the time when the late scribes wrote. The obsoleteness of fut. infin. with *μέλλω* in NT and papyri has been remarked already (p. 114 n.).

[[a] See p. 249.

is certainly very plausible, and opens out hints of exceedingly fruitful research on lines as yet unworked.

“Ecbatic” ἵνα.

The long debated question of “ἵνα ἐκβατικόν” may be regarded as settled by the new light which has come in since H. A. W. Meyer waged heroic warfare against the idea that ἵνα could ever denote anything but purpose. All motive for straining the obvious meaning of words is taken away when we see that in the latest stage of Greek language-history the infinitive has yielded all its functions to the locution thus jealously kept apart from it. That ἵνα normally meant “in order that” is beyond question. It is perpetually used in the full final sense in the papyri, having gained greatly on the Attic ὅπως. But it has come to be the ordinary construction in many phrases where a simple infinitive was used in earlier Greek, just as in Latin *ut* clauses, or in English those with *that*, usurp the prerogative of the verbal noun. “And this is life eternal, that they should know thee” (Jn 17^3), in English as in the Greek, exhibits a form which under other circumstances would make a final clause. Are we to insist on recognising the ghost of a purpose clause here?[a] Westcott says that ἵνα here “expresses an aim, an end, and not only a fact.” The ἵνα clause then, as compared with (τὸ) γινώσκειν, adds the idea of *effort* or *aim* at acquiring knowledge of God. I will not deny it, having indeed committed myself to the assumption as sufficiently established to be set down in an elementary grammar.[1] But I have to confess myself troubled with unsettling doubts; and I should be sorry now to commend that ἵνα as strong enough to carry one of the heads of an expository sermon!

Let us examine the grounds of this scepticism a little more closely. In Kälker's often quoted monograph on the language of Polybius, pp. 290 ff., we have a careful presentation of ἵνα as it appears in the earliest of the Κοινή writers, who came much nearer to the dialect of common life than the Atticists who followed him. We see at once that ἵνα has made great strides since the Attic golden age. It has invaded the territory of ὅπως, as with φροντίζειν and σπου-

---

[1] *Introd.*^{2} 217.

[[a] See p. 249.

δάζειν, to mention only two verbs found in the NT. The former occurs only in Tit 3^8; the latter eleven times. And instead of Attic *ὅπως*, or Polybian *ἵνα*, behold the infinitive in every occurrence of the two! Under Kälker's next head Polybius is brought into an equally significant agreement with the NT. He shows how the historian favours *ἵνα* after words of commanding, etc., such as *διασαφεῖν*, *αἰτεῖσθαι*, *γράφειν*, *παραγγέλλειν*, and the like. One ex. should be quoted: *συνετάξατο πρός τε Ταυρίωνα παρασκευάζειν ἱππεῖς πεντήκοντα καὶ πεζοὺς πεντακοσίους, καὶ πρὸς Μεσσηνίους, ἵνα τοὺς ἴσους τούτοις ἱππεῖς καὶ πεζοὺς ἐξαποστείλωσι.* The equivalence of infin. and *ἵνα* c. subj. here is very plain. In the later *Κοινή* of the NT, which is less affected by literary standards than Polybius is, we are not surprised to find *ἵνα* used more freely still; and the resultant idiom in MGr takes away the last excuse for doubting our natural conclusions. There is an eminently sensible note in SH on Rom 11^{11}, in which the laxer use of *ἵνα* is defended by the demands of exegesis, without reference to the linguistic evidence. The editors also (p. 143) cite Chrysostom on 5^{20}: *τὸ δὲ ἵνα ἐνταῦθα οὐκ αἰτιολογίας πάλιν ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεώς ἐστιν.* It will be seen that what is said of the weakening of final force in *ἵνα* applies also to other final constructions, such as *τοῦ* c. infin. And on the other side we note that *ὥστε* in passages like Mt 27^1 has lost its consecutive force and expresses a purpose.[a] It is indeed a repetition after many centuries of a development which took place in the simple infinitive before our contemporary records begin. In the time when the dative *δόμεναι* and the locative *δόμεν* were still distinct living cases of a verbal noun, we may assume that the former was much in use to express designed result: the disappearance of distinction between the two cases, and the extension of the new "infinitive mood" over many various uses, involved a process essentially like the vanishing of the *exclusively* final force in the normally final constructions of Greek, Latin, and English. The burden of making purpose clear is in all these cases thrown on the context; and it cannot be said that any difficulty results, except in a minimum of places. And even in these the difficulty is probably due only to the fact that we necessarily read an ancient language as foreigners: no difficulty ever arises in analogous phrases in our own tongue.

---

[a] See p. 249.

Latinism?

The suggestion of Latin influence in this development has not unnaturally been made by some very good authorities;[1] but the usage was deeply rooted in the vernacular, in fields which Latin cannot have touched to the extent which so far-reaching a change involves. A few exx. from papyri may be cited:—OP 744 (i/B.C.) *ἐρωτῶ σε ἵνα μὴ ἀγωνιάσῃς.* NP 7 (i/A.D.) *ἔγραψα ἵνα σοι φυλαχθῶσι* (cf BU 19 (ii/A.D.)). BU 531 (ii/A.D.) *παρακαλῶ σε ἵνα κατάσχῃς.* 625 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἐδήλωσα Λογγίνῳ εἵνα ἑτυμάσῃ.* OP 121 (iii/A.D.) *εἶπά σοι εἵνα δώσωσιν.* BM 21 (ii/B.C.) *ἠξίωσά σε ὅπως ἀποδοθῇ*: *ἀξιῶ* c. infin. occurs in the same papyrus. Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) *λέγω . . . ἵνα προσκυνήσῃς αὐτόν.* In such clauses, which remind us immediately of Mt 4^{3} 16^{20}, Mk 5^{10} 3^{9} etc., the naturalness of the development is obvious from the simple fact that the purpose clause with *ἵνα* is merely a use of the jussive subjunctive (above, pp. 177 f.), which makes its appearance after a verb of commanding or wishing entirely reasonable. The infinitive construction was not superseded: cf AP 135 (ii/A.D.) *ἐρωτῶ σε μὴ ἀμελεῖν μου.* We need add nothing to Winer's remarks (WM 422 f.) on *θέλω* and *ποιῶ* c. *ἵνα.* 1 Co 14^{5} is a particularly good ex. under this head, in that *θέλω* has both constructions: we may trace a greater urgency in that with *ἵνα*, as the meaning demands. From such sentences, in which the object clause, from the nature of the governing verb, had a jussive sense in it which made the subjunctive natural, there was an easy transition to object clauses in which the jussive idea was absent. The careful study of typical sentences like Mt 10^{25} 8^{8} (contrast 3^{11}) 18^{6}, Jn 1^{27} (contr. Lk 15^{19}) 4^{34} $15^{8.\,13}$, Lk 1^{43} (for which Winer quotes a close parallel from Epictetus), will show anyone who is free from predisposition that *ἵνα* can lose the last shred of purposive meaning.[2] If the recognition of a purpose conception will suit the context better than the denial of it, we remain entirely free to assume it; but the day is past for such strictness as great commentators like Meyer and Westcott were driven to by the supposed demands of grammar. The grammarian is left to investigate the extent to which the *ἵνα* construction ousted the infinitive after particular expressions, to observe the relative frequency of these usages in different authors, and to test the reality of Thumb's proposed test (above, p. 205) for the geographical distribution of what may be to some extent a dialectic difference.

---

[1] So Götzeler *De Polybi elocutione* 17 ff. for *προσέχειν ἵνα* and *παρακαλεῖν ἵνα μή*: also Kälker *op. cit.*, and Viereck *SG* 67. Against these see Radermacher *RhM* lvi. 203 and Thumb *Hellen.* 159.

[2] See further pp. 240 f.

Consequence. The consecutive infin. with *ὥστε* has been already alluded to as admitting something very much like a purely final meaning. The total occurrences of *ὥστε* in the NT amount to 83, in 51 of which it takes the infin. A considerable number of the rest, however, are not by any means exx. of what we should call *ὥστε* consecutive with the indicative: the conjunction becomes (as in classical Greek) little more than "and so" or "therefore," and is accordingly found with subj. or imper. several times. Of the strict consecutive *ὥστε* c. indic. there are very few exx. Gal 2^{13} and Jn 3^{16} are about the clearest, but the line is not easy to draw. The indicative puts the result merely as a new fact, co-ordinate with that of the main verb; the infinitive subordinates the result clause so much as to lay all the stress on the dependence of the result upon its cause. Blass's summary treatment of this construction (p. 224) is characteristic of a method of textual criticism which too often robs us of any confidence in our documents and any certain basis for our grammar. "In Gal 2^{13} there is at any rate a v.l. with the infin."—we find in Ti "a^{scr} *συνυπαχθηναι*"—, "while in Jn 3^{16} the correct reading in place of *ὥστε* is *ὅτι*, which is doubly attested by Chrys. (in many passages) and Nonnus."[a] Those of us who are not impressed by such evidence might plead that the text as it stands in both places entirely fits the classical usage. It is just "the importance attaching to the result"—to quote one of Blass's criteria which he says would have demanded the indic. in Ac 15^{39} in a classical writer—which accounts for the use of the indicative: in Jn 3^{16}, "had the other construction—*ὥστε δοῦναι*, *so much as to give*—been used, some stress would have been

---

[a] See p. 249.

taken off the *fact* of the gift and laid on the *connexion* between the love and the gift."[1] Even if the indicative construction was obsolete in the vernacular—which the evidence hardly suffices to prove—, it was easy to bring in the indicative for a special purpose, as it differed so little from the independent *ὥστε* = *and so.* The infinitives without *ὥστε* in consecutive sense were explained above (p. 204), upon Heb 6^{10}. So in OP 526 (ii/A.D.), *οὐκ ἤμην ἀπαθὴς ἀλόγως σε ἀπολείπιν*, "so unfeeling as to leave you," etc. Sometimes we meet with rather strained examples, as those in the Lucan hymns, $1^{54.\,72}$ especially. The substitution of *ἵνα* c. subj. for the infin. occasionally makes *ἵνα* consecutive, just as we saw that *ὥστε* could be final: so 1 Jn 1^{9}, Rev 9^{20}, Jn 9^{2}—where Blass's "better reading" *ὅτι* has no authority earlier than his own, unless Ti needs to be supplemented. Blass quotes a good ex. from Arrian, *οὕτω μωρὸς ἦν ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ.* We should not however follow him in making *ἵνα* consecutive in Lk 9^{45}, for the thought of a purpose of Providence seems demanded by *παρακεκαλυμμένον.* 1 Th 5^{4} we can concede, but 2 Co 1^{17} is better treated as final: Paul is disclaiming the mundane virtue of unsettled convictions, which *aims* at saying yes and no in one breath. See p. 249.

Infinitive as subject or object.

The infinitive when used as subject or object of a verb has travelled somewhat further away from its original syntax. We may see the original idea if we resolve *humanum est errare* into "there is something human in erring." But the locative had ceased to be felt when the construction acquired its commanding prevalence, and the indeclinable verbal noun could become nom. or acc. without difficulty. The *ἵνα* alternative appears here as it does in the purpose and consequence clauses, and (though this perhaps was mere coincidence) in the imperative use (pp. 176 and 178 f.). Thus we have Mt 5^{29} *al συμφέρει*, Mt 10^{25} *ἀρκετόν*, Jn 18^{39} *συνήθειά ἐστιν*, 1 Co 4^{3} *εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν*, Jn 4^{34} *ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν*, all with *ἵνα* in a subject clause. See Blass's full list, p. 228, and note his citation from "Barnabas" 5^{13}, *ἔδει ἵνα πάθῃ*: still more marked are such exx. (p. 229) as

---

[1] I quote from my *Introduction* 218, written before Blass's book.

Lk 1^{43}, 1 Jn 5^{3}, Jn 15^{13}, etc. The prevalence of the ἵνα in Jn has its bearing on Prof. Thumb's criteria described above (pp. 40 f. and 205); for if the fondness of Jn for ἐμός is a characteristic of Asia Minor, that for ἵνα goes the other way. It would be worth while for some patient scholar to take up this point exhaustively, examining the vernacular documents among the papyri and inscriptions and in the NT, with careful discrimination of date and locality where ascertainable. Even the Atticists will yield unwilling testimony here; for a "wrong" use of ἵνα, if normal in the writer's daily speech, could hardly be kept out of his literary style—there was a very manifest dearth of trained composition lecturers to correct the prose of these painful *littérateurs* of the olden time! Schmid, *Atticismus* iv. 81, shows how this "Infinitivsurrogat" made its way from Aristotle onwards. Only by such an inquiry could we make sure that the dialectic distribution of these alternative constructions was a real fact in the age of the NT. Tentatively I should suggest—for time for such an investigation lies wholly below my own horizon—that the preference was not yet decisively fixed on geographical lines, so that individuals had still their choice open. The strong volitive flavour which clung to ἵνα would perhaps commend it as a mannerism to a writer of John's temperament; but one would be sorry to indulge in exegetical subtleties when he substitutes it for the infinitive which other writers prefer.

The Accusative and Infinitive, and substitutes.

We might dwell on the relation of the accus. c. infin. (after verbs of saying, believing, and the like) to the periphrasis with ὅτι which has superseded it in nearly all the NT writers. But no real question as to difference of meaning arises here; and it will suffice to cite Blass's summary (pp. 230 ff.) and refer to him for details. He shows that "the use of the infinitive with words of believing is, with some doubtful exceptions, limited to Luke and Paul (Hebrews), being a 'remnant of the literary language' (Viteau [i.] 52)." So with other verbs akin to these: Luke is indeed "the only writer who uses [the acc. and infinitive] at any length, and even he very quickly passes over into the direct form." The use of ὡς instead of ὅτι is limited, and tends to be encroached upon by πῶς: cf Hatzidakis 19, who ought not however to have cited Ac 4^{21} in this connexion The combination ὡς ὅτι in 2 Co 5^{19} 11^{21}, 2 Th 2^{2}, is taken by Blass (*Gr.*^{2} 321 f.) as equivalent to Attic ὡς c. gen. abs., the Vulgate *quasi* representing it correctly. It must be noted that in the vernacular at a rather later stage it meant merely "that": thus CPR 19 (iv/A.D.) *πρώην βίβλια ἐπιδέδωκα τῇ σῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ ὡς ὅτι ἐβουλήθην τινὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου ἀποδόσθαι.* Wessely notes there, "ὡς ὅτι seem to be combined where the single word would be adequate." He quotes another papyrus, *ὡς ὅτι χρεοστεῖται ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύρις Ἰανός.* Two Attic inscriptions of i/B.C. show ὡς ὅτι c. superl. in the sense of ὡς or ὅτι alone: see Roberts-Gardner 179. Winer (p. 771) cites Xenophon, *Hellen.* III. ii. 14, *εἰπὼν ὡς ὅτι ὀκνοίη*, and Lightfoot (on 2 Th 2^{2}) and Plummer repeat the reference; but the editors have agreed to eject ὅτι from the text at that place. Its isolation in earlier Greek seems adequate reason for flouting the MSS here. Winer's citation from the Argument to the *Busiris* of Isocrates, *κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ ὡς ὅτι καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει*, will hardly dispose of Blass's "unclassical" (as Plummer supposes), since the argument is obviously late.[1] We may follow Lightfoot and Blass without much hesitation.

Nominative for Accusative.

In classical Greek, as any fifth-form boy forgets at his peril, the nominative is used regularly instead of the accusative as subject to the infinitive when the subject of the main verb is the same: *ἔφη οὐκ αὐτὸς ἀλλὰ Κλέωνα στρατηγεῖν.* This rule is by no means obsolete in NT Greek, as passages like 2 Co 10^{2}, Rom 9^{3}, Jn 7^{4} (WH *text*), serve to show; but the tendency towards uniformity has produced a number of violations of it. Heb 7^{24} has a superfluous *αὐτόν*, and so has Lk 2^{4}: Mt 26^{32} inserts *με*, Phil 3^{13} *ἐμαυτόν*, and so on. Blass, p. 238 f., gives instances, and remarks that translations from Latin (Viereck, *SG* 68) exhibit this feature.[a] Kälker (p. 280) anticipates Viereck in regarding this as a case of *propter hoc* as well as *post hoc.* But the development of

---

[1] Dr J. E. Sandys (*Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*, p. xxviii) makes the author of the ὑπόθεσις to the *Areopagiticus* "a Christian writer of perhaps the sixth century." He kindly informs me that we may assume the same age for that to the *Busiris.*

[[a] See p. 249

Greek in regions untouched by Latin shows that no outside influence was needed to account for this levelling, which was perfectly natural.

Mixed Construction. The accus. c. inf. and the ὅτι construction have been mixed in Ac 27^{10}, by an inadvertence to which the best Attic writers were liable. See the parallels quoted by Winer (p. 426), and add from humbler Greek OP 237 (ii/A.D.) δηλῶν ὅτι εἰ τὰ ἀληθῆ φανείη μηδὲ κρίσεως δεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα. Also see Wellh. 23.

The Articular Infinitive. We will proceed to speak of the most characteristic feature of the Greek infinitive in post-Homeric language. "By the substantial loss of its dative force," says Gildersleeve (*AJP* iii. 195), "the infinitive became verbalised; by the assumption of the article it was substantivised again with a decided increment of its power." Goodwin, who cites this dictum (*MT* 315), develops the description of the articular infinitive, with "its wonderful capacity for carrying dependent clauses and adjuncts of every kind," as "a new power in the language, of which the older simple infinitive gave hardly an intimation" The steady growth of the articular infinitive throughout the period of classical prose was not much reduced in the Hellenistic vernacular. This is well seen by comparing the NT statistics with those for classical authors cited from Gildersleeve on the same page of Goodwin's *MT.* The highest frequency is found in Demosthenes, who shows an average of 1·25 per Teubner page, while he and his fellow orators developed the powers of the construction for taking dependent clauses to an extent unknown in the earlier period. In the NT, if my calculation is right, there is an average of ·68 per Teubner page—not much less than that which Birklein gives for Plato. The fragmentary and miscellaneous character of the papyri make it impossible to apply this kind of test, but no reader can fail to observe how perpetual the construction is. I have noted 41 exx. in vol. i of BU (361 papyri), which will serve to illustrate the statement. An interesting line of inquiry, which we may not at present pursue very far, concerns the appearance of the articular infinitive in the dialects. Since it is manifestly developed to a high degree in the Attic orators, we should naturally attribute its frequency in the Hellenistic vernacular to Attic elements in the *Κοινή*; and this will be rather a strong point to make against Kretschmer's view (p. 33), that Attic contributed no more than other dialects to the resultant language. To test this adequately, we ought to go through the whole *Sammlung* of Greek dialect-inscriptions. I have had to content myself with a search through Cauer's representative *Delectus*, which contains 557 inscriptions of all dialects except Attic. It will be worth while to set down the scanty results. First comes a Laconian inscr. of ii/B.C., 32 (= Michel 182) *ἐπὶ τὸ καλῶς . . . διεξαγνηκέναι.* Then the Messenian "Mysteries" inscr., no. 47 (= M. 694, *Syll.* 653, 91 B.C.), which has four or five instances, all with prepositions. Four Cretan exx. follow, all from ii/B.C., and all in the same formula, *περὶ τῶ* (once *τοῦ*) *γενέσθαι* with accus. subject (Nos. 122–5 = M. 55, 56, 54, 60). (The Gortyn Code (Michel 1333, v/B.C.) has no ex., for all its length.) Then 148 (= M. 1001, the Will of Epikteta), dated cir. 200 B.C., in which we find *πρὸ τοῦ τὰν σύνοδον ἦμεν.* No. 157 (M. 417), from Calymnus, dated end of iv/B.C., is with one exception the oldest ex. we have: *οἱ παραγενόμενοι πᾶσαν σπουδὰν ἐποιήσαντο τοῦ {του} διαλυθέντας τοὺς πολίτας τὰ ποτ' αὐτοὺς πολιτεύεσθαι μετ' ὁμονοίας.* No. 171, from Carpathus, Michel (436) assigns to ii/B.C.: it has *πρὸ τοῦ μισθωθήμειν.* No. 179 (not in M.), from Priene, apparently iii/B.C., has *[περὶ τ]οῦ παρορίζεσθαι τὰγ χώραν.* The Delphian inscr. no. 220 has *πρὸ τοῦ παραμεῖναι.* Elis contributes one ex., no. 264 (= M. 197), dated by Michel in the middle of iv/B.C., and so the oldest quoted: *περὶ δὲ τῶ ἀποσταλᾶμεν . . . τὸ . . . ψάφισμα.* Finally Lesbos gives us (no. 431 = M. 357), from ii/B.C., *ἐπὶ τῶι πραγματευθῆναι.* I have looked through Larfeld's special collection of Bœotian inscriptions, and find not a single example. Unless the selections examined are curiously unrepresentative in this one point, it would seem clear that the articular infinitive only invaded the Greek dialects when the *Κοινή* was already arising, and that its invasion was extremely limited in extent. To judge from the silence of Meisterhans, the Attic popular speech was little affected by it. It would seem to have been mainly a literary use, starting in Pindar, Herodotus, and the tragedians, and matured by Attic rhetoric. The statistics of

Birklein (in Schanz *Beitr.*, Heft 7) show how it extends during the lives of the great writers, though evidently a matter of personal taste. Thus Sophocles has ·94 examples per 100 lines, Aeschylus ·63, and Euripides only ·37. Aristophanes has ·42; but if we left out his lyrics, the frequency would be about the same as in Euripides. This is eloquent testimony for the narrowness of its use in colloquial speech of the Attic golden age; and the fact is significant that it does not appear in the early *Acharnians* at all, but as many as 17 times in the *Plutus*, the last product of the poet's genius. Turning to prose, we find Herodotus showing only ·07 examples per Teubner page, and only one-fifth of his occurrences have a preposition. Thucydides extends the use greatly, his total amounting to 298, or more than ·5 a page: in the speeches he has twice as many as this. The figures for the orators have already been alluded to. The conclusion of the whole matter—subject to correction from the more thorough investigation which is needed for safety—seems to be that the articular infinitive is almost entirely a development of Attic literature, especially oratory, from which it passed into the daily speech of the least cultured people in the later Hellenist world. If this is true, it is enough by itself to show how commanding was the part taken by Attic, and that the literary Attic, in the evolution of the *Κοινή*.

The application of the articular infin. in NT Greek does not in principle go beyond what is found in Attic writers. We have already dealt with the imputation of Hebraism which the frequency of ἐν τῷ c. inf. has raised. It is used 6 times in Thucydides, 26 times in Plato, and 16 in Xenophon; and the fact that it exactly translates the Hebrew infin. with ב does not make it any worse Greek, though this naturally increases its frequency.[a] Only one classical development failed to maintain itself, viz. the rare employment of the infin. as a full noun, capable of a dependent genitive: thus in Demosthenes, τό γ' εὖ φρονεῖν αὐτῶν, "their good sense"; or in Plato, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ εἶναι. Heb 2^{15} διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν is an exact parallel to this last, but it stands alone in NT Greek, though Ignatius, as Gildersleeve notes, has τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν. The fact that ζῆν was by this time an entirely isolated infinitive form may account for its peculiar treatment.[b] A

[a b] See p. 249.

similar cause may possibly contribute to the common vernacular (not NT) phrase *εἰς πεῖν*,[1] which we compared above (p. 81) to the Herodotean *ἀντί* c. anarthrous infin. The prepositions which Birklein (p. 104) notes as never used with the infin. retain this disqualification in the NT: they are, as he notes, either purely poetical or used in personal constructions. It may be worth while to give a table of relative frequency for the occurrences of the articular infinitive in NT books. Jas has (7 =) 1·08 per WH page; Heb (23 =) 1·09; Lk (71 =) nearly ·99; Paul (106 =) ·89 (in Pastorals not at all); Ac (49 =) ·7 (·73 in cc. 1–12, ·68 in cc. 13–28); 1 Pet (4 =) ·59; Mt (24 =) ·35; Mk (13 =) ·32; Jn (4 =) ·076; Rev (1 =) ·027. [Mk] 16^{9-20} has one ex., which makes this writer's figure stand at 1·43: the other NT books have none. It will be found that Mt and Mk are about level with the Rosetta Stone.[2]

Τοῦ c. inf.

The general blurring of the expressions which were once appropriated for purpose, has infected two varieties of the articular infinitive. That with *τοῦ* started as a pure adnominal genitive, and still remains such in many places, as 1 Co 16^4, *ἄξιον τοῦ πορεύεσθαι*. But though the *τοῦ* may be forced into one of the ordinary genitive categories in a fair proportion of its occurrences, the correspondence seems generally to be accidental: the extension which began in the classical period makes in later Greek a locution retaining its genitive force almost as little as the genitive absolute. The normal use of *τοῦ* c. inf. is telic. With this force it was specially developed by Thucydides, and in the NT this remains its principal use. We will analyse the exx. given in the concordance, omitting those in which *τοῦ* is governed by a preposition, and those which are due to the LXX. Mt has 6 exx.: in one of them, 21^{32}, *τοῦ πιστεῦσαι* gives rather the content than the purpose of *μετεμελήθητε*. Luke supplies two-thirds of the total for the NT. In Lk we have 23 exx., of which 5 may be due to dependence on a noun, and about one-half seem clearly final; in Ac there are 21, with 2 adnominal, and less than half final. Paul shows 13 (only in Rom, Gal, 1 and 2 Co, Phil), but there is not one in which purpose is unmistakable. In Heb there is one adnominal, one (11^5) final or quasi-final. Jas 5^{17} (object clause), 1 Pet 4^{17} (adnominal), and the peculiar[1] Rev 12^7 supply the remainder. Before turning to grammatical detail, let us parenthetically commend the statistics just given to the ingenious analysts who reject the unity of the Lucan books. The uniformity of use is very marked throughout Lk and Ac: cf Ac 27^1 ("We"-document) with 15^{20} 20^3, Lk 21^{22} with Ac 9^{15}, Ac 20^{27} ("We"-document) with 14^{18}. Note also the uniform proportion of final *τοῦ*, and the equality of total occurrences. When we observe that only Paul makes any marked use of *τοῦ* c. inf., outside Lk and Ac (the two writers together accounting for five-sixths of the NT total), and that his use differs notably in the absence of the telic force, we can hardly deny weight to the facts as a contribution to the evidence on the Lucan question. In classifying the uses of this *τοῦ*, we note how closely it runs parallel with *ἵνα*. Thus Lk 17^1 *ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ . . . μὴ ἐλθεῖν*, and Ac 10^{25} *ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν* (cf 3^{12}), where the *τοῦ* clause represents a pure noun sentence, in which *τό* would have been more correct, may be paralleled at once by Lk 1^{43}, *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ*; After verbs of commanding we may have *τοῦ* or *ἵνα* We find the simple infin. used side by side with it in Lk $1^{76f.}$ (purpose) and 1^{79}. It is not worth while to labour any proof that purpose is not to be pressed into any example of *τοῦ* where the context does not demand it; but we must justify our assertion about Paul. It is not meant that there are no possible or even plausible cases of final *τοῦ*, but only that when Paul wishes to express purpose he uses other means. In the majority of cases *τοῦ* c. inf. is epexegetic (Rom 1^{24} 7^3 8^{12}, 1 Co 10^{13}), adnominal (Rom 15^{23}, 1 Co 9^{10} 16^4, 2 Co 8^{11}, Phil 3^{21}), or in a regular ablative construction (Rom 15^{22}, 2 Co 1^8). The rendering

---

[1] But not to *εἰς βάψαι*, OP 736 (cir. A.D. 1). Winer (413) cites two exx. from Theodoret. See Kühner^3 § 479. 2. Add an ex. with *ἄχρι* from Plutarch p. 256 D. An inscription of iii/B.C. (*OGIS* 41, Michel 370) has *ἀποσταλεὶς . . . ἐπὶ τὰς παραβολὰς τῶν δικῶν λαμβάνειν*: Dittenberger emends.

[2] See p. 241.

---

[1] WH make this a quotation from Dan $10^{13.\,20}$: the former verse names Michael, who in the latter says *ἐπιστρέψω τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ κτλ* (Theodotion) See below.

"so as to" will generally express it. The nearest to pure final force are Rom 6^6 and Phil 3^{10}; but in both it would be quite as natural to recognise result as purpose—the main purpose is expressed by a clause with *ἵνα* in each case, and the *τοῦ* c. infin. comes in to expound what is involved in the purpose stated. An extreme case of explanatory infin. is that in Rev 12^7, where *πόλεμος* is explained by *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* with subject in the nominative. The construction is loose even for the author of Rev, but the meaning is clear: we might illustrate the apposition by Vergil's "et certamen erat, *Corydon cum Thyrside*, magnum;" or more closely still—if we may pursue our former plan of selecting English sentences of similar grammar and widely different sense—by such a construction as "There will be a cricket match, the champions *to play* the rest."

Πρὸς τό and εἰς τό c. infin.

Two other modes of expressing purpose have been, to a more limited extent, infected by the same general tendency. *Πρὸς τό* c. infin. occurs 5 times in Mt and once in Mk, with clearly final force, except perhaps in Mt 5^{28}, where it might rather seem to explain *βλέπων* than to state purpose. Lk 18^1 and Ac 3^{19} stand alone in Luke, and the former is hardly final: we go back to a more neutral force of *πρός*—"with reference to the duty" (Winer). Paul has it 4 times, and always to express the "subjective purpose" in the agent's mind, as W. F. Moulton observes (WM 414 n., after Meyer and Alford). This then is a locution in which the final sense has been very little invaded. *Εἰς τό* c. infin. is almost exclusively Pauline. It occurs thrice in Mt, in very similar phrases, all final; Mk, Lk and Ac have it once each, with final force fairly certain. Jas and 1 Pet have two exx. each, also final; and the same may probably be said of the 8 exx. in Heb. The remaining 44 exx. are evenly distributed in Paul, esp. Rom, Th, and Co—none in Col, Philem and the Pastorals. Westcott on Heb 5^1 distinguishes between *ἵνα* and *εἰς τό*, which he notes as occurring in close connexion in a considerable number of passages: "*ἵνα* appears to mark in each case the direct and immediate end, while *εἰς τό* indicates the more remote result aimed at or reached." This seems to be true of both *τοῦ* and *εἰς τό*. Since we have seen that *ἵνα* itself has largely lost its appropriation to telic force, it would naturally follow that *εἰς τό* would lose it more easily: on the whole, however, this is hardly the case. On Heb 11^3, Moulton and Westcott, independently, insist on the perseverance of the final meaning, in view of the writer's usage elsewhere. The *εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι* (mark the perfect) will in this case depend on *κατηρτίσθαι*, and describe a contemplated effect of the *fiat* in Gen 1. Paul's usage is not so uniform. It is difficult to dispute Burton's assertion (*MT* § 411) that in Rom 12^3, 2 Co 8^6, Gal 3^{17} (not, I think,[1] in 1 Th 2^{16}) *εἰς τό* "expresses tendency, measure of effect, or result, conceived or actual." Add (with WM 414 n.) exx. of *εἰς τό* expressing the content of a command or entreaty (as 1 Th 2^{12}), or acting for the epexegetic inf. (1 Th 4^9). Purpose is so remote here as to be practically evanescent. We must however agree with SH in rejecting Burton's reasoning as to Rom 1^{20}; for this belongs to the category of passages dealing with Divine action, in which contemplated and actual results, final and consecutive clauses, necessarily lose their differentia. It has been often asserted—cf especially a paper by Mr A. Carr on "The Exclusion of Chance from the Bible," in *Expos.* v. viii. 181 ff.—that Hebrew teleology is responsible for the blurring of the distinction between purpose and consequence: it is a "subtle influence of Hebrew thought on the grammar of Hellenistic Greek." This might be allowed—as a Hebraism of thought, not language—in passages like that last mentioned, where the action of God is described. But the idea that "Hebrew teleology" can have much to do with these phenomena as a whole is put out of court by the appearance of the same things in language which Semitic influences could not have touched. We have already shown this for *ἵνα*. A few exx. may be cited for *τοῦ* from vernacular witnesses:—BU 665 (i/A.D.) *ἀμελεῖν τοῦ γράφειν*. BU 830 (i/A.D.) *χρὴ οὖν ἑτοιμάσειν καὶ προαιρεῖν, ἵν' ἔχι τοῦ πωλεῖν*: cf Mt 18^{25}, Jn 5^7, for parallel construc-

Evidence of the Papyri, etc.

---

[1] See Findlay *CGT in loc.*, where strong reasons are given for accepting Ellicott's interpretation, seeing here the *purpose* of God.

tions with *ἔχω*. BU 1031 (ii/A.D.) *φρόνησον τοῦ ποιῆσαι.* *JHS*, 1902, 369 (Lycaonian inscr., iii/A.D. or earlier) *τῷ διχοτομήσαντί με τοῦ τὸ λοεπὸν ζῆν εἶς* (cause). NP 16 (iii/A.D.) *κωλύοντες τοῦ μὴ σπείρειν*: cf Lk 4^{42}, Ac 14^{18}, etc. BU 36 (ii/iii A.D.) *τοῦ ζῆν μεταστῆσαι*: cf 2 Co 1^{8}. BU 164 (ii/iii A.D.) *παρακαλῶ σε . . . πεῖσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν.* BM 23 (ii/B.C.) *προσδεομένου μου τοῦ περιποιῆσαι.* BU 595 (i/A.D.) *τοῦ σὲ μὴι εὑρεθῆναι*, apparently meaning "because of your not being found," as if *τῷ*:[1] the document is illiterate and naturally ejects the dative. OP 86 (iv/A.D.) *ἔθος ἐστὶν τοῦ παρασχεθῆναι.* OP 275 (i/A.D.) *τοῦ ἀποσπαθῆναι ἐπίτειμον.* CPR 156 *ἐξουσίαν . . . τοῦ . . . θέσθαι*: cf 1 Co 9^{6}. BU 46 (ii/A.D.) *εὐκαιρίας . . . τοῦ εὑρεῖν*: cf Lk 22^{6}. BU 625 (ii/iii A.D.) *πᾶν ποίησον τοῦ σὲ ἀπενέγκε*: so 845 (ii/A.D.). The usage is not common in the papyri. Winer's plentiful testimony from LXX, Apocrypha, and Byzantine writers (WM 411) illustrates what the NT statistics suggest, that it belongs to the higher stratum of education in the main. For *εἰς τό* we may quote the recurrent formula *εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι*, which is decidedly telic: as PFi 2 (iii/A.D.) *quater*, OP 82 (iii/A.D.). Miscellaneous exx. may be seen in OP 69 (ii/A.D.), BU 18 (ii/A.D.), 195 (ii/A.D.), 243 (ii/A.D.), 321 (iii/A.D.), 457 (ii/A.D.), 651 (ii/A.D.), 731 (ii/A.D.), and 747 (ii/A.D.). Like the rather commoner *πρὸς τό*, it seems to carry the thought of a remoter purpose, the tendency towards an end. This is well shown by the cases in which the main purpose is represented by *ἵνα* or *ὅπως*, and an ultimate object is tacked on with the articular infinitive. Thus BU 226 (i/A.D.) *ὅπως εἰδῇ παρέσεσται* (= *-θαι*) *αὐτὸν . . . ὅταν κτλ . . . πρὸς τὸ τυχῖν με τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ βοηθείας.* OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *ὅπως φροντίσῃς ἀκόλουθα πρᾶξαι . . . πρὸς τὸ μὴ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πάλιν αὐτὸν ἐντυγχάνειν.* *ib.* [*ἵνα*] *δ' οὖν . . . διαμένῃ . . . ἡ χρῆσεις πρὸς τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἀπογραφῆς δεηθῆναι.* This kind of final force is just what we have seen in nearly all the NT exx.; nor do those in which the purpose is least evident go beyond what we see in these other illustrations.

Before dealing with the Participle proper, we may

---

[1] Cf 2 Co 2^{13}; LP*b* (ii/B.C.) *ἄλλως δὲ τῷ μηθέν' ἔχειν πλὴν τοῦ Πτολεμαίου.*

The Participle and the Verbal Adjectives.

briefly touch on another category closely connected with it. Brugmann has shown (*Idg. Forsch.* v. 89 ff.) that the Greek participle, formed with the suffixes *-nt-*, *-meno-*, and *-wos-* (*-us-*), represents the proëthnic participle, which was intimately connected with the tense system; while there are primitive verbal adjectives, notably that in *-to-*, which in other languages—Latin and English are obvious examples—have become associated more intimately with the verb. The -τός form in Greek has never come into the verb system; and its freedom from tense connexions may be seen from the single fact that "ama*tus* est" and "he is love*d*" represent different tenses, while "scrip*tum* est" and "it is writt*en*" agree.[1] Even in Latin, a word like *tacitus* illustrates the absence of both tense and voice from the adjective in its primary use. Brugmann's paper mainly concerns Latin and the Italic dialects, and we shall only pursue the subject just as far as the interpretation of the Greek -τός calls us. The absence of *voice* has just been remarked on. This is well shown by the ambiguity of ἀδύνατον in Rom 8^{3}: is it "incapable," as in Ac 14^{8}, Rom 15^{1}, or "impossible," as in the other NT occurrences? Grammar cannot tell us: it is a purely lexical problem. As to absence of *tense*, we may note that both in Greek and English this adjective is wholly independent of time and of "Aktionsart." Both ἀγαπητός and *beloved* may answer indifferently to ἀγαπώμενος, ἠγαπημένος, and ἀγαπηθείς. This fact has some exegetical importance. Thus in Mt 25^{41} the timeless adjective "cursed" would answer to the Greek κατάρατοι. The perfect κατηραμένοι has the full perfect force, "having become the subjects of a curse"; and this makes the predicate translation (RVmg "under a curse") decidedly more probable. That our *-d* (*-n*) participle has no tense force in itself, and that consequently we have no exact representative of either present, aorist or perfect participle passive in Greek, is a point that will often need to be borne in mind. The very word just used, *borne*, translates the present *αἰρόμενον* in Mk 2^{3}, while its punctiliar equivalent *brought* represents (RVmg) the aorist *ἐνεχθεῖσαν* in 2 Pet 1^{18}, and the similar *taken away* stands for *ἠρμένον* in Jn 20^{1}; and yet all these are called "past participle" in English grammars. Having cleared the way for a lexical treatment of the verbals in -*τός*, by leaving usage in each case to decide whether an intransitive, an active, or a passive meaning is to be assigned to each word, we may give two or three examples which will lead to a new point. *Συνετός* is a good example of an ambiguous word: it is always active, "intelligent," in NT, but in earlier writers it is also passive. LS cite Euripides *IT* 1092 *εὐξύνετος ξυνετοῖσι βοά* as combining the two. *Ἀσύνετος* in Rom 1^{31} is also active, but the next word *ἀσύνθετος*, combined with it by paronomasia, gets its meaning from the middle *συνθέσθαι*, "not covenanting." An example of the passive, and at the same time of the free use of these adjectives in composition, is *θεοδίδακτος* "God-taught." Intransitive verbs naturally cannot show passive meaning. Thus *ζεστός fervidus*, from *ζέ(σ)ω* "to boil." But when we examine *θνητός*, we see it does not mean "dying" but "mortal"; *παθητός* is probably not "suffering" but "capable of suffering," *patibilis*. So often with transitive verbs. "The 'invincible' Armada" would be rendered *ὁ ἀήττητος δὴ στόλος*: *invictus* would be similarly used in Latin, and "unconquered" can be read in that sense in English. A considerable number of these adjectives answer thus to Latin words in -*bilis*, as will be seen from the lexicon: we need cite no more here. It will be enough merely to mention the gerundive in -*τέος*, as it is only found in Lk 5^{38}, *βλητέον* "one must put." It is not unknown in the papyri, but can hardly have belonged to the genuine popular speech.

---

[1] The verbal adjective in *-no-* stands parallel with that in *-to-* from primitive times.

Participle for Indicative.

A considerable proportion of what we have to say about the Participle has been anticipated. One Hellenistic use, already adumbrated in the discussion of the Imperative (pp. 180 ff.), may be finished off at this point, before we go on to describe subordinate participial clauses. That the participle can be used for indicative or imperative seems to be fairly established now by the papyri. Let us present our evidence before applying it to the NT exx., which we have already given so far as the imperative is concerned. For indicative the following may be cited:—Tb P 14 (ii/B.C.) *τῶι οὖν σημαινομένωι Ἡρᾶτι παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον*, "I gave notice in person" (no verb follows). Tb P 42 (*ib.*) *ἠδικημένος* (no verb follows). AP 78 (ii/A.D.) *βίαν πάσχων ἑκάστοτε*, etc. (no verb). Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.) *γράψας ὅπως εἰδῇς, καὶ σὺ ἀναγωνίατος ἴσθει.* NP 49 (iii/A.D.) *ὅτι* ". . . *ἐξαγρήσαντες* . . . *καὶ* . . . *σφετερίσαντες, καὶ ἀπάντηκα αὐτοῖς.* . . ." On GH 26 (ii/B.C.), *ὃ συνεπικελευούσης τῆς τούτων μητρὸς Θρῆρις τῆς Παῶτος συνευδοκοῦντες τῶν προγεγρα(μμένων)*, the edd. remark: "The construction is hopeless; one of the participles *συνεπικ.* or *συνευδ.* must be emended to the indicative, and the cases altered accordingly." The writer of the papyrus uses his cases in a way which would have convicted him of Semitic birth before any jury of NT grammarians not very long ago; but if *συνευδοκοῦμεν* is meant by the *συνευδοκοῦντες*, we may perhaps translate without emendation, taking *τῶν π.* as partitive gen. like Ac 21^{16} (*supr.*, p. 73). In Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) *ἔντευξιν ἡμῖν προφερόμενοι* comes in so long a sentence that the absence of finite verb may be mere anacoluthon. OP 725 (ii/A.D.) *ὁ δὲ Ἡ. εὐδοκῶν τούτοις πᾶσι καὶ ἐκδειδάξειν*, "H. agrees to all this, and to teach," etc. In CPR 4 (i/A.D.), *καὶ μηδένα κωλύοντα*, for *κωλύειν*, seems to be the same thing in *orat. obl.*, but more clearly due to anacoluthon. For the imperative there is the formula seen in G 35 (i/B.C.) *ἑαυτῶν δὲ ἐπιμελόμενοι ἵν' ὑγιαίνητε* (1st person plural precedes): so Par P 63, G 30, Path P 1, Tb P 12 (all Ptolemaic), etc. FP 112 (i/A.D., translated above, p. 178) *ἐπέχον* (= *-ων*) *Ζωίλωι καὶ εἵνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσης.* Tb P 59 (i/B.C., = Witk. p. 88) *ἐν οἷς ἐὰν προσδέησθέ μου ἐπιτάσσοντές μοι προθυμότερον*—following a gen. abs.[1] The writer is "an official of some importance" (G. & H.) who bears a Greek name. We may observe that the participial use we are discussing is in the papyri not at all a mark of inferior education. Though fairly certain, it was not very common. It may be recalled that in a prehistoric stage Latin used the participle for an indicative, where the 2nd plur. middle for some reason became unpopular; and *sequiminī* = *ἑπόμενοι* not only established itself in the present, but even produced analogy-formations in future and imperfect, and in the subjunctive.[1] Cf the constant ellipsis of *est* in perfect indic. passive. If further analogies may be permitted, we might refer to the plausible connexion claimed between the 3rd plural indicative and the participle in all languages of our family: *bheronti* (*ferunt*, *φέρουσι*, Gothic *bairand*, etc.), and *bheront-* (*ferens*, *φέρων*, *bairands*). These analogies are only adduced to show that the use of the participle always lay ready to hand, with or without the auxiliary verb, and was a natural resource whenever the ordinary indicative (or, less often, imperative) was for any cause set aside. In D we find this use apparently arising from the literal translation of Aramaic: see Wellh. 21. We may proceed to give some NT passages in which the participle appears to stand for an indicative: those where the imperative is needed were given on pp. 180 ff. As before, we shall begin with those from Winer's list (p. 441 f.) in which we may now reject his alternative construction. Rom 5^{11} *καυχώμενοι* is most naturally taken this way: Winer's explanation seems forced. The *α*-text MSS correctly glossed the true reading with their *καυχώμεθα*. In Heb 7^{2} we might have to take refuge in explaining *ἑρμηνευόμενος* as an indicative, if we felt ourselves tied to *ὃς συναντήσας* in v.^{1}, which is read by ℵABC²DEK 17. But it seems clear that we may here accept the conjecture of C*LP and the later MSS, the doubled sigma being a primitive error parallel with those in 11^{35} *γυναῖκας* (ℵAD and the new Oxyrhynchus papyrus) and 11^{4} *αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ* (where Hort's *αὐτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is now found in the papyrus, as well as in Clement): this is an excellent witness to the scrupulous accuracy of the *β*-text in preserving even errors in its ancient source. In Heb 8^{10} 10^{16} *διδούς* is parallel to *ἐπιγράψω*, if the order of thought is to be maintained: the LXX had *διδοὺς δώσω*, but AQ and Heb omit *δώσω* (because there was only the simple Qal in the Hebrew?), leaving *διδούς* to do the work of an indicative. Winer (p. 717) would make *ἐπιγράψω* a substitute for participle, as in Col 1^{26}, 1 Co 7^{37}, etc. In Ac 24^{5} *εὑρόντες* arrives at the goal by the way of anacoluthon—Luke cruelly reports the orator *verbatim*. In 2 Co 7^5 θλιβόμενοι is most simply taken in this way: perhaps παρεκλήθημεν was in mind for the main verb. Ἀπαγγέλλων in the *a*-text (HLP and cursives) of Ac 26^{20} would be explained thus, though the influence of ἐγενόμην is still consciously present: were this a marked irregularity, the Syrian revisers would hardly have admitted it. In Rom 12^6 ἔχοντες is I think for ἔχομεν: see above, p. 183. In Rev 10^2 ἔχων is for εἶχεν: Winer allows that "ἐστί [rather ἦν] may be supplied." So $21^{12.\,14}$. A different class of participle altogether is that coming under the head of "hanging nominative," which our own nominative absolute translates so exactly that we forget the genitive presumed in the Greek. Heb 10^1 will be a case in point if the text is sound—Westcott and Peake accept δύναται, which is strongly supported by the combination DH boh vg: the RV (so W. F. Moulton, *Comm. in loc.*) follows the construction expressly vouched for by Theophylact, reading ἔχων as an "absolute clause." In Phil 1^{30} ἔχοντες similarly takes the place of a gen. abs. (or dat. agreeing with ὑμῖν)—the construction is taken up as if ἐλάβετε had preceded.[1] The idiom in fact is due merely to anacoluthon: see other exx. in WM 716 and Jannaris *HG* 500. Answering Viteau, who as usual sees Hebraism here, Thumb observes (*Hellenismus* 131) that the usage is found in classical Greek, and in Hellenistic both in and outside Biblical Greek, "and is the precursor of the process which ends in MGr with the disappearance of the old participial constructions, only an absolute form in -οντας being left." This construction is identical, to be sure, with the *nom. pendens* unaccompanied by the participle: it is as common in English as in Greek, and just as "Hebraistic" in the one as in the other.[2]

---

[1] Add PP ii. 19 *ἀξιῶ σε* . . . *δοὺς κτλ* (*q.v.*), and G 30 (=Witk. p. 83).

---

[1] *Sequiminī* imperative has a different history: cf the old infinitive ἑπέμεναι, Skt. *sacamane*. See p. 241.

Participles with εἶναι.

We saw when we first introduced the participial substitute for indicative or imperative (p. 182), that its rationale was practically the suppression of the substantive verb. Our next subject will therefore naturally be the use of the participle in periphrastic tenses. Since the question of Semitism is rather acute here, we will deal with it first. Blass (pp. 202 ff.) discovers the influence of Aramaic especially in the periphrastic imperfect: in the case of Mt, Mk, Lk and Ac 1–12 "this is no doubt due to their being direct translations from Aramaic originals"—"*based on* direct translations," would be a better way to put it. Schmid (*Attic.* iii. 113 f.) has a valuable note, in which, after sketching the extent of this periphrasis in classical Greek and literary *Κοινή*, he remarks that in Par P he can only find it in future-perfects, and twice in optative with aor. participle. Comparing this scanty result with "the extraordinary abundance of the participial periphrasis in NT . . ., one cannot avoid separating the NT use from that of the *Κοινή*, and deriving it from the Heb. and Syr. application of the participle." We can of course have no objection to this, within limits. In translated Greek, as we have seen again and again, we expect to find over-literal renderings,—still more to find an overdoing of correct idioms which answer exactly to locutions characteristic of the language rendered. The latter is the case here. No one denies that periphrasis is thoroughly Greek: see the page and a half of classical exx. in Kühner-Gerth i. 38 ff. It is only that where Aramaic sources underlie the Greek, there is inordinate frequency of a use which Hellenistic has not conspicuously developed. Cf Wellh. 25. The exx. in Jn (see Blass 203 n.) and Paul we may treat on purely Greek lines. By way of further limiting the usage, we observe that the imperfect is the only tense in which correspondence with Aramaic is close enough to justify much of a case for dependence. No less an authority than Wellhausen warns us not to carry the thesis into the imperative: "*Ἴσθι* in imperative before participle or adjective often occurs (Mk 5^{34}, Lk 19^{17}), and in consideration of Prov 3^{5} LXX is not to be treated as an Aramaism" (*Comm.* on Mt 5^{25}). Then we note the papyrus usage. *Ἔχων ἐστί* and *δέον ἐστί* (with other impersonal verbs) are both classical and vernacular. The future *ἔσομαι* c. perf. part. is well kept up in the papyri, and so is the periphrastic pluperfect: thus, OP 285 (i/A.D.) *ὃν ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένος χιτῶνα*, Par P 8 (ii/B.C.) *ὧν ἤμην δι᾽ αὐτῶν παραμεμετρηκυῖα.* There can be no thought of Aramaisms here.[1] But BU 183 (i/A.D.), ἐφ’ ὃν χρόνον ζῶσα ᾖ, is rather limited illustration for the present participle in this usage. Winer however cites Lucian, observing that its common appearance in the LXX "was but seldom suggested by the Hebrew." In classical Greek Rutherford showed (*CR* xvii. 249) that the idiom imparts a special emphasis. So in Thuc. iv. 54 ἦσαν δέ τινες καὶ γενόμενοι τῷ Νικίᾳ λόγοι, "some proposals were even *actually* made to N." Antiphon (Fr. M. 3. 67) ἦν ὁ γρῖφος ἐνταῦθα ῥέπων, "the puzzle *did indeed* mean as much." Aristoph. *Ach.* 484 ἕστηκας; οὐκ εἶ καταπιὼν Εὐριπίδην; "afraid to go! not *effectually* saturated with Euripides!" May we not apply this in the originally Greek parts of NT—*e.g.* Gal 1$^{22f.}$, "I was *entirely* unknown—only they had been *hearing*"? (Cf Lightfoot.) Paul has only one other ex. in imperfect, Phil 2^{26}, where ἐπιποθῶν and ἀδημονῶν seem decidedly adjectival, and not at all improved by reading them as imperfect. (No one would cite 2 Co 5^{19}.) Blass well remarks that in Jn "in most passages ἦν has a certain independence of its own"; and he further notes that in Ac 13–28, where Aramaic sources are almost entirely absent, the Semitisms fail, except in 22^{19}, in a speech delivered in Aramaic. The total number of exx. of pres. partic. with imperf. of εἶναι is for Mt 3 (only 7^{29} possibly Aramaising), Mk 16, Lk 30, Ac (1–12) 17, (13–28) 7, Jn 10, Paul 3, 1 Pet 1.[2] Large deductions would have to be made from these figures, on any theory, to get the maximum of exx. for the supposed literal translation of an Aramaic periphrastic imperfect. Even in Mk and Luke the ἦν is generally very distinct from the participle; and whatever was the Aramaic original, we may be quite sure that such expressions as we find in Mk 10^{32} or Lk 4^{33} owe nothing to it in this way. See p. 249.

---

[1] Lightfoot rejects the alternative punctuation (WH) which would treat ἥτις . . . πάσχειν as a parenthesis. So Kennedy (*EGT in loc.*)—rightly, it seems to me.

[2] Add 1 Th 2^{11}: see Dr G. Milligan *in loc.*

The participle as a whole has diverged so little from earlier usage that we have not very much more to say. The *tenses* need no further discussion in this volume; and for our present purpose little need be added to what was said about the articular participle on pp. 126 f. An

---

[1] Three papyri of iii/A.D. have aor. ptc. with εἰμί in fut. perf. sense. Note *Syll.* 928^{52} (ii/B.C.) ἀποκεκριμένης οὔσης: Arist. *Ran.* 721 shows this in colloquial Attic. So Col 1^{21}.

[2] I count ἑστώς as a present, but omit ἐξὸν ἦν, and give Jn 1^{9}, but not Lk 3^{23}

Articular Participle.

idiomatic use of *ὁ ὤν* may be noted in Ac 13^1 *κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν*, "the local church," 14^{13} D *τοῦ ὄντος Διὸς Προπόλεως* (or *πρὸ πόλεως*).[1] Cf Ramsay's remark (*Ch. in Rom. Emp.* 52, quoting J. A. Robinson), that in Ac *ὁ ὤν* "introduces some technical phrase, or some term which it marks out as having a technical sense (cf 5^{17} 13^1 28^{17}), and is almost equivalent to *τοῦ ὀνομαζομένου*." An ingenious person might apply this in Eph 1^1 to the text with *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* absent; but the usual view needs no defence against such an alternative. With *αἱ οὖσαι* in Rom 13^1 we may compare Par P 5 (ii/B.C.) *ἐφ᾽ ἱερέων καὶ ἱερειῶν τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν.* On the crucial passage Rom 9^5 see SH p. 235 f., with whom I agree, though the argument that "He who is God over all," would have to be *ὁ ἐπὶ π. θ.* might perhaps be met by applying the idiom noted above for Ac, with a different *nuance*. *Θεός* may still be subject, not predicate, without making *ὤν* otiose: the consciousness of Ex 3^{14} might fairly account for its insertion. It is exegesis rather than grammar which makes the reference to Christ probable. One other Pauline passage claims a brief note, Col 2^8, where the natural *ὃς συλαγωγήσει* is replaced by *ὁ συλαγωγῶν*, to give "directness and individuality to the reference" (Lightfoot). Relative clauses are frequently ousted by the articular participle, which (as Blass observes) had become synonymous therewith.

Participle as Complement.

There is a marked diminution in the use of the participle with verbs like *τυγχάνω, ἄρχομαι, λανθάνω, φαίνομαι*, etc. But this was, partly at any rate, mere accident, for *τυγχάνω* c. part. is exceedingly common in the papyri: "I happen to be" is a phrase NT writers would instinctively avoid. *Καλῶς ποιήσεις* c. aor. part. (sometimes infin., or even indic., but the participle greatly predominates) is the normal way of saying "please" in the papyri, and is classical. So 3 Jn ^{6}, and in the past Ac 10^{33}, Phil 4^{14}: cf 2 Pet 1^{19}. I cannot agree with Blass's "incorrectly *εὖ πράσσειν* in Ac 15^{29}" (p. 245)—

---

[1] Cf respectively BM iii. p. 136 (18 A.D.) *ἐπὶ ταῖς οὔσαις γειτνίαις*, Tb P 309 (ii/A.D.), *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἐν κώμηι [τοῦ ἱεροῦ] θεοῦ μεγάλου Κρόνου*—also such phrases as *τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς Χοιάκ*, NP 49 (iii/A.D.), "the *current* month."

except in the query he attaches to the remark. Surely this is an ordinary conditional sentence, "If you keep yourselves free from these things, you will prosper"? *Εὖ ποιήσετε*, from vernacular usage, would suggest "you will oblige us"; but Blass can hardly mean this. With verbs like *οἶδα, ὁμολογῶ, μανθάνω*, the participle is being encroached upon: it appears regularly in 2 Co 12^2, 1 Jn 4^2 (not B), 2 Jn^7, Lk 8^{46}, Ac 24^{10}, but is generally replaced by acc. and inf. or a *ὅτι* clause. So Par P 44 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 58) *γίνωσκέ με πεπορεῦσθαι*, and the recurrent *γινώσκειν σε θέλω ὅτι*: for the participle cf BU 151 (Christian period—*ἴσθι*), TP 1 (ii/B.C.—*ὁμόλογος*), NP 1 (ii/A.D.—*εἰ μάθοιμι*, the optative of which suggests culture), *al.* Of course Phil 4^{11}, *ἔμαθον . . . εἶναι* "I have learned how to be," is classically correct: 1 Tim 5^{13} is in any case no ex. of *μανθάνω* c. part., for this could only mean "learn that they are going about." (The RV rendering is supported by Winer with Plato *Euthyd.* 276B *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσι*, and the parallel phrase *διδάσκειν τινὰ σοφόν*: Field adds from Chrysostom *εἰ ἰατρὸς μέλλεις μανθάνειν*, with other parallels. The construction—*μανθάνω* as passive of *διδάσκω*—is not unnatural in itself. Despite Weiss, the absolute *μανθ.* seems intolerable, and there is no real alternative, unless with Blass we boldly insert *εἶναι*.)

Participial Clauses.

We come then to the manifold uses of the participle as forming an additional clause in the sentence. This is one of the great resources of Greek, in which the poverty of Latin shows markedly by contrast. Our own language comes much nearer, but even with the help of auxiliaries we cannot match the wealth of Greek: thus, we cannot by our participle distinguish *λελυκώς* and *λύσας*. The elasticity of Greek however has its disadvantages, such as the possibility of supplying in translation particles as widely apart as *because* and *although*. But it seldom happens that serious ambiguity arises from this absence of strict logical differentiation.

In Conditional,

We need spend little space in classifying participial usages. We have already seen (pp. 170 f.) that one important criterion has disappeared in Hellenistic, by the encroachments of *μή* over the whole field, when in classical Greek it was essentially conditional. We return to this point presently. The participle in *conditional* clauses is still found very freely. It stands for ἐάν c. aor. subj. in Lk 9^{25} compared with Mt 16^{26}; for εἰ c. pres. indic. in 1 Co 11^{29}. There seem to be no exx. of its substitution for εἰ c. opt., or εἰ c. *indic. irreal.*; but this is an accident, due to the relatively small number of sentences of the kind. **"Conjunctive,"** Another class is called by Blass "*conjunctive*": 1 Tim 1^{13} ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα (cf Ac 3^{17}) is his ex. In Mt 6^{27} we have a choice—"Who can by worrying," or "even *if* he does worry, add a span to his life?" **Concessive,** *Concessive* clauses are often expressed with the participle alone: Rom 1^{32} "though they know," Jas 3^{4} "big though they are," 1 Co 9^{19} "free though I am," Jude ^{5} (not causal, as Winer), etc. Where ambiguity is possible, we sometimes find the meaning fixed by καίπερ, as Phil 3^{4}, 2 Pet 1^{12}, and Heb *ter*; once by καίτοι, Heb 4^{3}, καὶ ταῦτα Heb 11^{12}, or καί γε Ac 17^{27}—note the οὐ there surviving, with characteristic emphasis. **Causal,** The opposite *causal* sense is exceedingly common: so Ac 4^{21}, Heb 6^{6} (unless temporal), Jas 2^{25}, Mt 1^{19}, etc. **Final,** *Purpose* is less often expressed by the participle, as the future was decaying:[1] we have however Mt 27^{49}, and two or three in Luke. The present sometimes fulfils this function, as in Ac 15^{27}. **Temporal and Attendant Circumstances Clauses.** Finally come the *temporal* clauses, or those which describe the *attendant circumstances* of an action: *e.g.* Mt 13^{2} ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι, "when he had entered, he sat down."[2] We should not usually put a temporal clause to represent these, as it would overdo the emphasis: in comparatively few cases, like Ac 17^{1} and similar narrative passages, we might replace with ἐπεί or ὅτε. Our English participle is generally the best representative, unless we change it to the indicative with *and*: Latin, unless the ablative absolute can be used, necessarily has recourse to *cum* c. subj., its normal method of expressing attendant circumstances. The pleonastic participles λαβών, ἀναστάς,

---

[1] It was not however by any means dead: cf the string of final fut. participles in OP 727 (ii/A.D.); BU 98 (iii/A.D.), Ch P 4 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 70), etc.

[2] See p. 241.

πορευθείς, ἀπελθών, largely occurring in translated passages have been already referred to (p. 14). One interesting Aramaism may be noted here from Wellhausen (p. 22). He asserts that in Mk 2^7 *λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ* (without stop) literally translates two Aramaic participles, the second of which should in Greek appear as a participle. In Lk 22^{65} we find *βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον* correctly. But it must be noted that with the RV punctuation Mk *l.c.* is perfectly good Greek, so that we have no breach of principle if we do allow this account of the passage.

The large use of participles in narrative, both in grammatical connexion with the sentence and in the gen. abs. construction (p. 74), is more a matter of style than of grammar, and calls for no special examination here.

Οὐ with participle.

We may close our discussion with some notes on the places in which the ordinary rule, that *μή* goes with the participle, is set aside. The number of passages is not large, and they may well be brought together.[1] Mt (22^{11}) and Jn (10^{12}) have one each; Luke (Lk 6^{42}, Ac 7^5 26^{22} $28^{17.\ 19}$) five; and there are two each in Heb ($11^{1.\ 35}$) and 1 Pet (1^8 2^{10}—a quotation). Paul has Rom 9^{25} and Gal 4^{27} *bis* (quoted), 1 Co 9^{26}, 2 Co $4^{8.\ 9}$ *quater*, Gal 4^8, Phil 3^3, Col 2^{19}: 1 Th 2^4 and 2 Pet 1^{16} have *οὐ . . . ἀλλά*. Before discussing them, let us cite some papyrus exx. for *οὐ*. OP 471 (ii/A.D.) *τὸν οὐκ ἐν λευκαῖς ἐσθῆσιν ἐν θεατρῷ καθίσαντα*: cf Mt *l.c.* OP 491 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν τελευτήσω οὐδέπω πεπληρωκότων* (when they are not yet 25). AP 78 (ii/A.D.) *οὐ δυνάμενος ἐγκαρτερεῖν ἐπιδίδωμι*: contrast 1 Th 3^1. OP 726 (ii/A.D.) *οὐ δυνάμενος δι' ἀσθένειαν πλεῦσαι* since he cannot): so 727 (ii/A.D.). Tb P 41 (ii/B.C.) *οὐ στοχασάμενος* (= *-ου*) *ὧν ἔχομεν . . . πίστεων* (in a long gen. abs. succession): so Par P 40 *οὔτε τοῦ ἱεροῦ στοχασάμενοι οὔτε τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος*. Par P 13 (ii/B.C.) *κρατοῦσιν οὐκ ἀναπέμψαντες τὴν φέρνην*. Tb P 34 (ii/B.C.) *μὴ παρανοχλείθω* (*sic*) *ὑπ' οὐδενός*. BU 361 (ii/A.D.) *χώραν οὐκ ἔχει, οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος τί ἐκεῖνος ἀπεκρείνατο*. See also Par P 14, OP 286 (i/A.D.), TP 1 (ii/B.C.), 3 and 8 (ii/B.C.). In many of these

---

[1] I omit *οὐκ ἐξόν*, used for indic., and the common vernacular phrase *οὐχ ὁ τυχών*. In the exx. of *οὐ . . . ἀλλὰ . . .* the negative tinges the whole sentence.

exx. we can distinctly recognise, it seems, the lingering consciousness that the proper negative for a statement of a downright fact is *οὐ*. The same feeling may have made *οὐ* rise to the lips when an emphatic phrase was wanted, as in the illiterate Tb P 34 above. The closeness of the participle to the indicative in the kinds of sentence found in this list makes the survival of *οὐ* natural. Much the same principles may be applied to the NT, though in Luke, Paul and Heb we have also to reckon with the literary consciousness of an educated man, which left some of the old idioms even where *μή* had generally swept them away. In two passages we have *οὐ* and *μή* in close contact. Mt 22[11] (see parallel above) is followed in the king's question by *πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων . . .;* The distinction is very natural: the first is a plain fact, the second an application of it. The emphasis would have been lost by substituting *μή*. In Pallis's MGr version of the Gospels the two phrases are alike translated with *δέν* and indic. (The completeness of MGr levelling is well illustrated by his version of Lk and Jn *ll.cc.* The former becomes *καὶ . . . δὲν* c. indic.; the latter is *καὶ βοσκὸς μὴν ὄντας*, followed by *ποὺ δὲν εἶναι τὰ πρόβατα δικά του*, "whose own the sheep are not." Outside the indicative *δέν* is not found.) 1 Pet 1[8] is best left to Hort: "The change of negative participles . . . is not capricious. The first is a direct statement of historical fact; the second is introduced as it were hypothetically, merely to bring out the full force of *πιστεύοντες*." Though Blass thinks it artificial to distinguish, it is hard to believe that any but a slovenly writer would have brought in so rapid a change without any reason. The principles already sketched may be applied to the remaining passages without difficulty, in so far as they are original Greek. In the quotations from the LXX we have, as Blass notes, merely the fact that לֹא c. partic. was regularly translated with *οὐ*. The passages in question would also come very obviously under the rule which admits *οὐ* when negativing a single word and not a sentence.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

◆

P. 2.—Thumb points out (*Hellen.* 125) that Josephus has only been convicted of *one* Hebraism, the use of *προστίθεσθαι* c. inf. = "to go on to do" (הֹסִיף לְ, *i.e.* "to do again"). (For this, cf Wellh. 28.) He refers to Schmidt *Jos.* 514–7, and Deissmann *BS* 67 n. That the solitary Hebraism in the Palestinian writer should be a lexical one, not a grammatical, is suggestive.

P. 7.—In the *Expositor* for September 1905, Prof. Ramsay says that the earlier tombs at Lystra show *Latin* inscriptions, while at Iconium Greek is normal. This may involve our substituting Latin as the language of Paul's preaching at Lystra: such a conclusion would not in itself be at all surprising.

P. 8.—"Even a Palestinian like Justin knew no Hebrew," says Dalman (*Words* 44) in arguing against Resch's theory of a primitive Hebrew Gospel.

P. 10.—Lightfoot (on Gal 4^6) prefers to regard Ἀββά ὁ πατήρ in Mk 14^{36} as spoken by our Lord in this form. He cites from Schöttgen the address מרי כירי, in which the second element (*κύριε*) emphasises the first by repetition; and he compares Rev 9^{11} 12^9 20^2. Thus understood, the phrase would be a most emphatic "testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen." But Lightfoot's first alternative (practically that of the text) seems on the whole more probable.

P. 16.—In Ac 2^1 D, Blass puts a full stop at the end of the verse. But we might translate without the stop:—"It came to pass during those days of fulfilment of the day of Pentecost, while they were all gathered together, that lo! there was . . ." This is the (*b*) form, with *καὶ ἰδού*, so that it comes near (*a*). This punctuation helps us to give adequate force to the durative infin. *συμπληροῦσθαι*. On this view D gives us one ex. of the (*a*) form, and one of the (*b*), to reinforce the more or less doubtful ex. of (*b*) in the ordinary text of Ac 5^7. Those who accept Blass's theory of Luke's two editions might say that the author had not quite given up the (*a*) and (*b*) constructions when he wrote his first draft of Ac: before sending the revised edition to Theophilus, he corrected what remained of these (like a modern writer going over his proofs to expunge "split infinitives"), but overlooked 5^7. I am not commending that view here; but I may suggest a systematic study of the *grammar* of the D text in Luke as a probably fruitful field for those who would contribute to the greatest of all textual problems in the NT.

P. 23.—We might have expected to find a specimen of Cretan in Tit 1^{12}; but if Epimenides the Cretan was really the author of this unflattering description of his countrymen, he waited till he came to Athens, where (among other advantages for this composition) he could write ἀεὶ and disyllabic *ἀργαί*. Plato makes him reach Athens just before the Persian War.

P. 30.—It may be worth while to add a note illustrating the early date at which some characteristic MGr elements began to appear in the vernacular.

On a Galatian tombstone of vi/A.D.(*BCH* 1903, 335) the word ἀνάπαυσις is written ἀν<ἀπ>αψις, showing the fully developed result of the pronunciation of αυ as *av*: cf MGr ἔπαψα from παύω. Ramsay (*C. and B.* ii. 537) notes κατεσσκέβασα (*BCH* 1888, 202), which is an ex. of the same phenomenon. He also gives a Christian inscription of iii/A.D. from Phrygia, containing the 3 pl. ἐπιτηδεύσουν, and "an anticipation of the modern periphrastic future" in βουληθῇ ἀνοῖξι, noted by Mordtmann. We may add the gen. ἐσοῦ from ii/A.D., as OP 119, 528, 531, *al.* But Thumb (in *BZ* ix. 234) cites a yet earlier ex., ἔχουσες for nom. or acc. pl. fem., from an inscription of i/A.D. Cod A reads σαράκοντα in Jn 8^{57}.

P. 43.—S. Langdon (*AJP* xxiv. 447 ff.) examines the history of ἐάν for ἄν, and agrees with Winer, who thinks it a peculiarity of the popular language (WM 390). Mr Langdon attributes it to "the effort to emphasise the abstract conditional aspect of the relative clause. This would of course occur much more frequently with relatives without antecedent than when they were defined by an antecedent. . . . This popular idiom met the necessity which the LXX translators felt in their effort to distinguish between the complete and incomplete relative clauses when translating from Hebrew. . . . In the NT the rule of using ἐάν in sentences without antecedent is invariably followed, almost invariably in the OT and in Christian Greek writers." Mr Langdon's trust in his one or two exx. from classical MSS can hardly be shared; and before we can feel sure that the LXX translators themselves used this ἐάν, and meant anything by the distinction, we should at least have examined the early papyri very carefully. The earliest exx. quotable are Hb P 96 and 51, PP iii 43, of iii/B.C., and BM 220 *bis*, G 18, Tb P 12 *bis*, 105, 107, from ii/B.C. A suggestive ex. is Tb P 59 (99 B.C.), where the sentence is translatable with either interpretation of ἐάν. It may be noted that the rarity of antecedent in these relative sentences makes it easy to misinterpret statistics. See Mayser, p. 152.

P. 44.—Ἐφιορκεῖν, banned by WH as "Western," occurs frequently in inscriptions and papyri. See Schwyzer *Perg.* 118 for exx. and an explanation (Thumb's).

P. 55.—A more peculiar product is [ἐπικα]λέομε (=-αι) in Audollent no. 189 (Rome), to which Prof. Thumb calls my attention. So καλέω *ib.* no. 15 (Syria, iii/A.D.). That these are genuine survivals of uncontracted forms (*e.g.* from Epic dialect) is very improbable.

P. 58.—"Pindaric Construction," when the verb *follows*, is hardly anacoluthic: it is due to a mental grouping of the compound subject into one entity —"flesh and blood" = "humanity," "heaven and earth" = "the universe." A papyrus ex. may be cited: BU 225 (ii/A.D.) ὑπάρχι δὲ αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ οἰκίαι δύο καὶ κτλ. So also 537.

P. 60.—Meisterhans^{3} 203 (§ 84) cites a number of exx. from Attic inscriptions of v/ and iv/B.C., where in a continued enumeration there is a relapse into the nominative. Gildersleeve adds *CIA* I. 170–173 (v/B.C. = Roberts-Gardner no. 97) τάδε παρέδοσαν . . . στέφανος . . . φιάλαι etc.

P. 63.—To discuss this large question for individual exx. would take us too long. Blass in § 39. 3 states the case fairly: he notes that the misuse of εἰς was still a provincialism, which in respect of the *local* signification of εἰς and ἐν is not present in the Epistles nor (strangely enough) in Rev, though found in all the narrative writers of the NT. Hatzidakis 210 f. illustrates both the use of εἰς for ἐν and that of ἐν for εἰς: for the latter, add the early Par P 10 ἀνακεχώρηκεν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ. (He should not have cited 2 Tim 1^{11}, where εἰς is perfectly normal.) We need not accept all Blass's exx.: thus Jn 17^{23} is surely "perfected *into* one." But it must be confessed that our evidence now makes it impossible to see in Jn 1^{18} (*ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον*) "the combination . . of rest and motion, of a continuous relation with a realisation of it" (Westcott). Without further remark we will reserve discussion till the time comes for treating the prepositions systematically, only noting that in D there are suggestive substitutions of *ἐν* for *εἰς* in Ac 7^{12} 8^{23} (the latter however probably involving an entirely different sense—see p. 71), and *εἰς* for *ἐν* in Ac 11^{25} (*ἐστὶν εἰς Τάρσον*). On this cf Wellh. 12.

P. 65.—D often, as Wellhausen notes (p. 13), shows acc. with *ἀκούειν*, *κατηγορεῖν*, and *κρατεῖν*, where the other texts have gen.

P. 67.—Both in Ac 16^{34} and in 18^{8}, D alters the dat. to *ἐπί* (*εἰς*) c. acc.; but in the latter a clause is added containing *πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ*.

P. 69.—Blass's objection to recognising the noun Ἐλαιών, in Ac 1^{12} and Josephus, rests upon the fact that assimilation of case is generally practised, and that in *τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν* the genitive is unmistakable. But the nom. is frequent in LXX (Thackeray): thus Gen 3^{20}, Num 21^{14}. See also Deissmann *BS* 210. Blass rightly, I think, regards Jn 13^{13} as a vocative, and not as equivalent to *φωνεῖτέ με τὸν διδάσκαλον*; but Winer's 1 Sam 9^{9} is a clear ex. to put by Rev 9^{11} and Blass's own Mk 3^{16} (as found in Δ and the Latt.). It is noteworthy that both Luke and Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 169 *πρὸς ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον* Ἐλαιων, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 262 *εἰς τὸ* Ἐλαιων *καλούμενον ὄρος*) not only use the unambiguous genitive *-ῶνος* (*Ant.* vii. 202 *διὰ τοῦ* Ἐλαιῶνος *ὄρους*) but also put the anarthrous *ἐλαιων* in combination with the word *called.* This seems to show that the name was not yet fixed in the Greek speech of Jerusalem residents, and that the halfway-house to the full proper name wanted some apology. Τὸ *ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν* will thus be a translation of the native name. The new name for the hill would spring from two sources, the vernacular word for *oliveyard*, and the impulse to decline the stereotyped *ἐλαιῶν*. An exact parallel for the latter was quoted in *Expos.* VI. vii. 111. In the Ptolemaic papyri Tb P 62, 64, 82, 98 the noun *ἰβίων* is found, which the editors connect closely with *ἰβίων* (*τροφῆς*) "for the feeding of ibises," the word being treated as nom. sing. instead of gen. pl.: they observe that "the declension of the village called Ἰβίων probably contributed to the use of this curious form." In both words then we see a gen. pl. made into a new nominative which coincides with a noun of slightly different meaning already existing.

P. 70.—Prof. Thumb tells me that the construction (parenthetic nominative) survives in MGr: thus (*ἀπ'*) *ἐδῶ καὶ πέντε μέρες* [nom.] = "heute vor 5 Tagen." E. W. Hopkins (*AJP* xxiv. 1) cites a rare use from Skt.: "a year (nom.) almost, I have not gone out from the hermitage." *Contra*, Wellh. 29.

Ib.—Εἰκόνες perhaps should be translated: it is the name given in BU 1059 (i/B.C.) to the personal descriptions which accompany an IOU, receipt, bill of sale, census paper, etc.

Ib.—The vocative *ἡ παῖς*, as Dr Rendel Harris reminds me, literally translates the Aramaic absolute טְלִיתָא (as Dalman gives it, *Gramm.* 118 n). I should have remarked that the usage is commonest where there is translation from Semitic. The author of Heb does not use it except in OT citations, nor does Luke in Ac 13–28 (though we may note that in the three citations involved there is no article in the Hebrew). It is only another instance of over-use of an idiom through its coincidence with a native usage.

P. 74.—See Kühner-Gerth i. 401 n. $^{5.\,6}$, for these genitives after a negative adjective. Typical exx. are Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.) *al*, *ἀκίνδυνος παντὸς κινδύνου*, *ἀνυπόλογον πάσης φθορᾶς*, and *ἀνυπεύθυνοι παντὸς ἐπιτίμου*. Tb P 124 (ii/B.C.) *ἀδιστάστους ὄντας πάσης αἰτίας*. BU 970 (ii/A.D.) *τῆς εἰς ἅπαντας εὐεργεσίας* . .

ἀβοήθητος. They illustrate *ἄνομος θεοῦ* in 1 Co 9^{21} = *ἄνευ νόμου θεοῦ*, which differs only in that the genitive is subjective, while the rest are either objective genitives or pure ablatives.

Ib.—One or two parallels may be added for the free use of the gen. abs. For the substitution of gen. for the case in construction, cf Tb P 41 (ii/B.C.), *ἱκανῶν ἡμῶν ὑπόπτως ἐχόντων ἀνακεχωρήκαμεν*; BU 1040 (ii/A.D.) *χαίρω ὅτι μοι ταῦτα ἐποίησας, ἐμοῦ μεταμελομένου περὶ μηδενός*. Other exx. will be seen in *CR* xv. 437. For gen. abs. without expressed subjects, cf BU 925 (iii/A.D. ?) *ἀναγνωσθέντων*, 970 (ii/A.D.) *δηλωθέντος δι' ἧς προείθη μοι ἀσφαλείας*, etc.

P. 78.—Elative comparatives may be seen in D in Ac 4^{16}, *φανερότερόν* (*sic*) *ἐστιν*, and 10^{28} *βέλτιον ἐφίστασθε* (= *ἐπ.*—cf p. 44, and WH *App*^{2} 151). It substitutes *πλεῖστοι* for *πλείους* in 19^{32}, and adds an elative *ἥδιστα* in 13^{8}. On 10^{28} Blass compares 24^{22} 25^{10} in the ordinary text, and 2 Tim 1^{18}, Jn 13^{27}. As to *χείρων*, we should add that *χείριστος* is found in Tb P 72 (ii/B.C.), *al.*

P. 79.—Before leaving the subject of comparison, we ought to remark on curious forms which have been brought into existence by the weakening of the old formations, or their detachment from the categories of comparative and superlative. Beside the regular form *ἐλάχιστος*, which is predominantly superlative in Mt, but elative in Lk (*ter*, and 12^{26} doubtful) and Jas, Paul uses *ἐλαχιστότερος* in Eph 3^{8}, whether as comparative or true superlative the sentence leaves uncertain. He uses *ἐλάχιστος* as superl. in 1 Co 15^{9}, and as elative in 4^{3} 6^{2}. The double comparative *μειζότερος* occurs in 3 Jn ^{4}: cf our *lesser*, which is equally due to the absence of clear comparative form in a word whose meaning is clear. See Jannaris *HG* 147 for a list of these forms: add *μειζότερος*, *Archiv* iii. 173 (iv/A.D.) *al*, *μεγιστότατος* BM 130 (i/ii A.D.), *πρεσβυτερωτέρα* BM 177 (i/A.D.), *πρώτιστα* BU 665 (i/A.D.). Exx. are found even in Homer (*πρώτιστος*).

On the Aramaising use of positive c. *ἤ* or *παρά* for compar., see Wellh. 28.

P. 81.—Wellhausen (p. 26) finds in the Synoptists some traces of *insertion* of the article through literal translation of Semitic idiom: here again D is conspicuous. Thus Mt 10^{29} *τοῦ ἀσσαρίου*. Note also his exx. of Semitism arising from the rule which drops the article with a noun in construct state preceding a *definite* noun: so Mt 12^{42} "*the* Queen of the South."

P. 82.—Westcott translates *ἐν συναγωγῇ* (Jn 6^{59} 18^{20}) "in time of solemn assembly." Our own use of "in church," "in or out of school," etc., is enough to illustrate this phrase, which must be explained on the lines described in the text above: Westcott seems to be somewhat overpressing it.

P. 84.—On the presence or absence of the article when a prepositional clause has to be added as an epithet, cf J. A. Robinson, *Ephes.* 149. For its presence may be cited such passages as Eph 1^{15}, for its omission, Eph 2^{11} 4^{1}, Phil 1^{5}, Col. $1^{4, 8}$.

It is only very seldom that we find in Greek of the NT types the complex arrangement by which the classical language will wrap up a whole series of adjuncts between the article and its noun. 1 Pet 3^{3} will serve as an exceptionally good example. The simplicity of NT style naturally causes less involved forms to be generally preferred.

One more *paralipomenon* under the Article may be brought in. In Prof. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, no. 110 (ii/A.D.), there is a bilingual inscription, Palmyrene-Aramaic and Greek, containing within its compass a good parallel to the genealogy in Lk 3^{23-38}: *Ἀαιλάμειν Αἱράνου τοῦ Μοκίμου τοῦ Αἱράνου τοῦ Μαθθᾶ* (Wadd. 2586). There are one or two other specimens: in 113 the article is dropped for the last two steps, as in the first step in 110.

P. 85.—In Mt 6^{17} note that D reads *ἄλειψον*, rejecting the middle in view of the presence of *σου*. In Ac 5^{2} *ἔθετο* and ^{21} *συγκαλεσάμενοι*, D makes the opposite change, which in the former case, at any rate, is no improvement.

P. 88.—Cf Wellh. 30: "*ἴδιος* in Mt and Lk is sometimes 3rd pers. possessive."

P. 89.—Prof. Thumb notes how *accent* may differentiate words capable of full or attenuated meaning: "God *is*," but "God is *Almighty*."

P. 94.—To the exx. cited from Blass (top of p. 95) add from Hawkins Jn 1^{27} (taken like Lk 3^{16} from the original source in Mk 1^{7}), Ac 15^{17} (LXX), Rev 3^{8} 7$^{2.9}$ 13$^{8.\,12}$ 20^{8}, and 1 Pet 2^{24} (Ti with א* LP, against ABCK). The idiom is in one place translation Greek, and in the rest a sign of inferior Greek culture, which makes it the more striking that Lk and Jn (not Mt) faithfully copy their source. Since the Greek of 1 Pet is remarkably good, it does not seem likely that *οὗ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ* is due to the autograph: the LXX *αὐτοῦ* may well have been added by a glossator who did not notice that the *οὗ* made it needless. This consideration may fairly be set against the *a priori* argument of Ti in favour of the reading of א. See p. **249.**

P. 96.—Cf Josephus *Ant.* i. 29, *αὕτη μὲν ἂν εἴη πρώτη ἡμέρα, Μωυσῆς δ' αὐτὴν μίαν εἶπε* (quoted by Schmidt). Note in Gen 8^{13} the variation *μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου, μιᾷ τοῦ μηνός*, which had adequate motive in the different words of the Hebrew. Prof. Thumb has traced the history of the Greek names for the days of the week in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* i. 163–173 (1901).

P. 102.—The importance of Heb 13^{24} in critical questions justifies our adding one more note on *ἀπό*. In *Theol. Rundschau* v. 64 Deissmann writes two "marginalia" upon Harnack's famous article in *ZNTW* i. 16 ff. He notes the *masculine διηγούμενον* in 11^{32}—not, I presume, as a difficulty likely to give Harnack much trouble; and observes that *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας* "can, according to the late Greek use of *ἀπό*, describe very easily the greetings of the brethren to be found *in* Italy." He refers to the article by E. Bröse in *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, pp. 351–360, on *ἀπό* in 1 Co 11^{23}. Bröse examines *ἀπό, παρά, ὑπό*, and *ἐκ*, showing that in daily speech these prepositions were used without exactness of distinction. The argument is designed to show that *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου* in 1 Co *l.c.* does not mean by *tradition*, but by *revelation* from the Lord. Deissmann observes that Bröse could have made his treatment of *ἀπό* still more illuminating, if he had gone outside the NT: he refers to a "stop-gap" of his own in *Hermes* xxxiii. 344, which touches on the passage from Heb.

P. 105.—On *ὑπέρ* we may cite TP 8 (ii/B.C.) *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν φρονῶν*: cf Rom 12^{3}.

P. 112.—A very good ex. in Greek is 2 Co 4^{8}, where perfective *ἐξ* shows the *ἀπορία* in its final result of despair.

P. 116.—In the Dream of Nectonebus, the last Egyptian king of the old dynasties (LP*u*, ii/B.C.), there occurs the phrase *διατετήρηκα τὴν χώραν ἀμέμπτως*, which gives a striking parallel to 2 Tim 4^{7}. The perfective in the king's words emphasises the fact that the watchful care has been successful; the simplex in Paul lays the stress on the speaker's own action, "I have *guarded* my trust."

P. 118.—Hawkins, *HS* 142, gives the number of compound verbs for the several parts of the NT. His figures work out thus:—Heb has 7·8 per WH page, Ac 6·4, Lk 6·0, Mk 5·7, Paul 3·8, Mt 3·6, Cath. Epp. and Rev 3·1, and Jn 2·1. The high figure of Mk in this table may be illustrated by the large use of compounds in many uneducated papyri (*e.g.* Tb P 413, of ii/iii A.D.—see my notes in *CQ* ii. 140). That Heb and Luke (whose unity comes out by this, as by so many other tests) should be at the top, is what we might expect.

P. 126.—Since writing this, I have noticed Prof. Ramsay's suggestive language on the early Christians of the average type in *C. and B.* ii. 485: see also his *Paul* 208 f.

Pp. 126 and 129.—On the biblical use of present and aorist imperative, cf F. W. Mozley in *JTS* iv. 279 ff. Prof. Thumb notes that Mozley independently confirms his judgement on the aoristic προσέφερεν in Heb 11^{17}, by the observation that φέρε and ἄγε are aoristic in meaning. Were the author Mark or the John of Rev, and the context less clamant for an imperfect, I should readily yield.

P. 132.—See now D. Smith, *In the Days of His Flesh*, p. 208.

Ib.—In *OGIS* 219 (iii/B.C.) there is an ex. of *coincident* ἀσπασάμενοι which may be worth quoting:—ἑλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὰς . . . [οἵτινες] ἀσπασάμενοι αὐτὸν παρὰ τ[οῦ δήμου πρῶτον μὲν κελεύσουσιν ὑ]γιαίνειν . . . [ἔπειτα δ᾽ ἀπαγγελοῦσιν αὐτῶι τὴν τι]μήν. The "salutation" seems to *consist in* the double message: it is difficult anyhow to make it *precede* the wish for good health.

P. 143.—In Mt 25^{24} we find ὁ εἰληφώς in a phrase otherwise parallel with v.^{20}, ὁ λαβών. The intervening space supplies an excuse for the change which takes it out of the category described in the paragraph above. Both tenses were entirely justifiable, and the rather more emphatic perfect suits the situation of v.^{25} better.

P. 145.—I must make it clear that in this tentative account of ἔσχηκα—which is propounded with great hesitation, and with a full appreciation of its difficulties—there is no suggestion that the aoristic meaning proposed was more than an idiosyncrasy of individual writers, or (better) of certain localities. The pure perfect force is found long after Paul's day: thus in the formula of an IOU, ὁμολογῶ ἐσχηκέναι παρὰ σοῦ διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου χρῆσιν ἔντοκον (BU 1015—early iii/A.D.), "to have received and still possess." But in AP 30 (ii/B.C.), προσεμαρτύρουν τὸν M. κατεσχηκέναι τὸν οἰκίαν πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου, the aoristic *possessed* seems to be recognisable, in an early illiterate document. See p. 248.

P. 146.—Οἶμαι δὲ κἂν Λαμπιδώ, τὴν Λεωτυχίδου μὲν θυγατέρα, Ἀρχιδάμου δὲ γυναῖκα, Ἄγιδος δὲ μητέρα, οἳ πάντες βασιλεῖς γεγόνασι, θαυμάσαι ἂν κτλ. It is hard to see why this should be cited as aoristic: Agis was on the throne at the supposed time of the dialogue.

P. 148.—In connexion with this paragraph should be mentioned the birth of the new present στήκω (MGr στέκω) from the perfect ἕστηκα, with the same meaning.

P. 152.—On this view of the prehistoric relations of act. and mid., cf Hirt, *Indog. Forsch.* xvii. 70. The theory had been restated in terms of the new school of philology, in Osthoff and Brugmann's pioneer *Morphologische Untersuchungen* iv. 282 n. (1881). There H. Osthoff conjectures that "Skt. *dvéṣ-ṭi* and *dviṣ-ṭé* depend on one and the same proethnic basis-form [*dueistai*], which was differentiated by the accent, according as one wished to say '*hátes* for himself' or 'hates for *himsélf*.'" I had overlooked this passage, and am all the more confirmed by it in the theory which I had independently developed as to the relationship of the voices in the element they severally emphasise.

On the late Greek developments of the voices the student should carefully observe the rich material in Hatzidakis 193 ff.

P. 156.—The proverb in 2 Pet 2^{22} is acutely treated by Dr Rendel Harris, as I ought to have remembered, in *The Story of Aḥiḳar*, p. lxvii. He cites as the probable original words appearing in some texts of Aḥikar: "My son, thou hast behaved like the swine which *went to the bath* with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it.'

If, as seems extremely likely, this is the source of the παροιμία to which 2 Pet refers, of course λουσαμένη is used in its correct sense. That a Greek iambic verse may have been the medium of its transmission had been anticipated : see Mayor *in loc.* I leave my note unaltered in view of the measure of uncertainty attaching in Dr Harris's judgement to the account he proposes.

P. 166.—Dr P. Giles, in a letter endorsing and improving my Scotch translation of Homer *Il.* i. 137, says, "I agree that ἄν is very like *jist*, and if you had added *like* at the end you would have got your subjunctive also. This *like* does for many dialects what the subjunctive did for Greek, putting a statement in a polite, inoffensive way asserting only verisimilitude." It is found elsewhere.

P. 168.—Add to this list the curious anti-Christian inscription in Ramsay, *C. and B.* ii. 477 (no. 343) οὗτος ὁ βίος μοι γέγονεν (aoristic !) ὅταν ἔζων ἐγώ.

P. 169.—Since writing the paragraph on εἰ μήτι ἄν, I have observed several other exx. of εἰ . . . ἄν in illiterate Greek of a century or two later than the NT. An inscription from Cyzicus, lately published by Mr F. W. Hasluck in *JHS* xxv. 63, has ἴ τις δ' ἂν τολμήσι, μετέλθῃ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός. (The second subjunctive here is the itacistic equivalent of the optative which would have been used in earlier Greek : cf p. 199 n.). In Ramsay's *C. and B.* vol. ii. I note the following :—No. 210 (p. 380) εἰ δέ τις ἂν φανείη . . . ἔσται . . ., where the optative shows the writer a bit of an Atticist, but not very successful. No. 377 (p. 530) κατεσκεύασεν τὸ ἡρῷον ἑαυτῇ καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς Εὐτύχῃ καὶ εἴ τινι ἂν ζῶσα συνχωρήσει· εἰ δὲ μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν μου ἐάν τις ἐπιχιρήσει κτλ. No. 273 (p. 394) εἰ δὲ [ἕτερος] ἂν ἐπιχειρή[σει, θή]σει κτλ. Add PFi 50^{113} (iii/A.D.) εἴ τι δὲ ἐὰν ὀφίλῃ, Tb P 391^{22} (99 A.D.) ἴ τις δὲ ἡμῶν . . . ἐὰν παραβῇ.

P. 170.—On μή in questions see J. E. Harry, *Gildersleeve Studies*, 430. He shows it was absent from orators and historians, and from the later writers Aristotle, Polybius, and Diodorus. Plato uses it 24 times ; but the 69 occurrences in NT outnumber those in all the prose and poetry of ten previous centuries. The inference is that it was a feature of everyday language. In nearly half the exx. the verb is *be*, *can*, or *have* ; three-fourths of the total comes from Jn and Paul (only Rom and Co).

P. 171.—For ἐκτὸς εἰ μή see Deissmann, *BS* 118. Cf also Ramsay, *C. and B.* ii. 391 (no. 254) χωρὶς εἰ μή τι πάθῃ.

Ib.—On the encroachments of μή, especially as to ὅτι μή and μή c. inf. after *verba dicendi et cogitandi*, see E. L. Green in *Gildersleeve Studies*, 471 ff. Green shows how μή intrudes increasingly in the Κοινή literature. Considering the extent of this intrusion in the time of the NT, there are fewer exx. of μή wrongly used than would be expected, except that μή holds almost undisputed sway over the participle. There are 6 exx. of μή c. inf. after a verb of saying or denying [Lk 22^{34} must however be struck off (WH, following ℵBLT)] ; 2 with verbs of thinking (2 Co 11^{5}, Ac 25^{25}) ; one case of causal ὅτι μή, Jn 3^{18} ; 3 of μή after relatives. (In excluding Col 2^{18} because an imper. precedes, Green ignores a yet more decisive reason—that μή is indisputably spurious.) The participle with μή in *orat. obl.* occurs only in Ac 23^{29} 28^{6} ; in causal, concessive, and temporal clauses it abounds. The comparison of Plutarch with the NT shows a great advance in the use of ὅτι μή. The whole paper deserves study.

A few papyrus passages may be cited in illustration of the subjects of Green's paper. For μή in relative clauses :—BU 114 (ii/A.D.) προοῖκα ἣν ἀποδέδωκεν αὐτῷ μήτε δύναται λαβεῖν, CPR 19 (iv/A.D.) ἐντάξας . . . ἃ μὴ συνεφώνησα. For *verba dic. et cog.* :—MP 25 (iii/B.C.) μὴ ὀφείλειν ὀμόσας μοι, BM 401 (ii/B.C.) κατεγνωκὼς μὴ δύνασθαι, OP 266 (i/A.D.) ὁμολογεῖ μὴ ἐνκαλεῖν (classical, as ὁμ. =

undertakes), OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *ἀπεκρείνατο μὴ* c. inf., and several cases with *δηλοῦν* (BU 5, 11, etc.). For *ἐπεὶ μή* cf BU 530 (i/A.D.) *μέμφεταί σε ἐπὶ μὴ ἀντέγραψας αὐτῇ* (the *charge*, like the ex. in Jn *l.c.*).

On *εἰ οὐ* Blass notes (*Hermes* xxiv. 312) its identity with *ἂμ μή* in the illiterate OP 119 (see p. 28).

A note may be added on *μὴ ὅτι*; for though the NT only uses *οὐχ ὅτι*, the syntax is identical with that in *μήτιγε*, 1 Co 6^{3} ("not to speak of mere affairs of daily life"). It occurs in BM 42 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 40) *μὴ ὅτι γε τοσούτου χρόνου ἐπιγεγονότος*, "not to speak of so much time having gone by."

P. 177.—In Mt 6^{19} D reads *μὴ θησαυρίσεται* (= -ε), which may just possibly be added to the list. But it is more likely to be a mere mistake. An earlier ex. of *μή* c. fut. than those cited in the text is Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) *μὴ γοῦν καὶ κρατήσεις*—but this may be aor. subj.

P. 181.—Essentially the same principle must be traced in *ἵλεώς σοι* (Mt 16^{22}), "[God be] merciful to thee." The interjectional adjective and participle are on the same footing, and must be explained in the same way. In *CR* xv. 436 are quoted inscriptional parallels for this phrase (Gen 43^{23}, 2 Sam 20^{20}, 1 Chr 11^{19}):—Letronne 221 (iv/A.D.) *ἵλεως ἡμῖν Πλάτων καὶ ἐνταῦθα*, and without subject 557 *ἵλεώς σοι, Ἑρμείας . . . καὶ Ἡράκλειος ἀδελφός*. Letronne also quotes another inscription (ii. 286) *ἵλεώς σοι ἀλυπί* (*leg.* Ἀλύπι), "[Sarapis] help thee, Alypius," as I read it. With the development of a deprecatory force in such phrases we may compare that in our vernacular expression, "Mercy on us!"

P. 182.—Dr Rendel Harris thinks the *ὑμεῖς* may be only translation Greek. The suggested allusion to Paul is in any case only propounded tentatively. It is curious that *ἀρξάμενος* gives us trouble elsewhere in Luke. Ac 10^{37} is fairly hopeless as it stands, and Blass thinks *ἀρξ. ἀπὸ τ. Γ.* interpolated from Lk 23^{5}. It is conceivable that *ἀρξάμενος γάρ* in AD vg may preserve the relics of a better text, in which a new sentence beginning there was continued with *Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ N., ὃν* (D) *ἔχρισεν . . ., οὗτος* (D). The change needed to make the D reading grammatical is but small. (See Wellh. 12.) A quasi-adverbial use of *ἀρξάμενος* may be seen in *Syll.* 537^{5}, 538^{5}, 540^{152}, 549^{4}, and with pres. ptc. in Tb P 526 (ii/A.D.).

P. 185.—The practically complete equivalence of subjunctive and future is quite as evident in Phrygian inscriptions as in the Alexandrian Greek Bible or late Egyptian papyri. Thus we have in *JHS* xxiii. 85 *εἰ δέ τις ἀνύξας ἕτερον βάλῃ*, and in Ramsay *C. and B.* ii. 392 (no. 260) *εἴ τινα ἄλλον βουληθῇ*, 559 (no. 445, iii/A.D.) *εἴ τις δὲ ἕτερος ἐπισενένκει* (so nos. 448, 449). In nos. 317, 391, 395, 399 *al* (pp. 472, 535–8) we have *οὐ τεθῇ* for the *οὐ τεθήσεται* found elsewhere. The progressive disappearance of the Future prepares us for MGr, where the tense is a periphrastic one. For the papyri, cf BU 303 (vi/A.D.) *παράσχω* "I will furnish," AP 144 (v/A.D.) *ἔλθω* "I will come." Innumerable exx. of verbs in *-σει* and the like, in locutions requiring subjunctives, could be cited from various sources; but these being itacistic prove less—see p. 35.

P. 194.—Prof. Thumb tells me that MGr *μὴ γένοιτο* seems to him a phrase of learned origin. (I notice that Pallis retains it in Lk 20^{16}.) See p. 249.

P. 199 n. 2.—Prof. Thumb observes that he does not believe in itacism as contributory to the obsolescence of the optative, "since the coincidence of *οι* and *η* took place very late." It has been made clear in the text that the optative was doomed from the very birth of the *Κοινή*, while *οι* (and *υ*) did not become simple *i* for several centuries.

P. 208.—By way of adding to our illustrations from the Bezan text of Ac, we may note that in 12^{17} D substitutes *ἵνα σιγ[. . .]σιν* for *σιγᾶν*, and in 16^{18} *ἵνα ἐξέλθῃς* for *ἐξελθεῖν*, both after words of commanding. In 17^{31} however the omission of *ἐν ᾗ μέλλει* adds to the tale of quasi-final infinitives. Were this tendency to use *ἵνα* more marked, it might help us to fix the *provenance* of D, by the use of Thumb's canon (p. 205).

P. 216.—Some further exx. are noted by Votaw (p. 18) from the LXX. He gives on p. 19 the totals for the articular infin. in OT, Apocrypha, and NT: there are 1161 occurrences with a preposition, and 1614 without. The anarthrous infin. occurs 6190 times in all. In the statistics of the articular infin. I have checked my count (based on MG) by Votaw's: they differ slightly where I have omitted passages which WH enclose in double brackets, and also through my not counting twice the places where two infinitives stand under the government of a single article. Votaw's total for Heb has a slight error.

P. 224.—To the footnote it should be added that Hirt and Sommer make *sequimini* imperative the original form, supposing it simply transferred to the indicative at a later stage (*Indog. Forsch.* xvii. 64).

P. 230.—The phrase in Mt 13^2 is quoted here purely as it stands in Greek; exx. of this participle could be cited from almost any page of narrative in the NT or other Greek writing. It happens however, as Dr Rendel Harris tells me, that my example is a translation of a phrase meaning simply "he went on board a boat." He observes, "'To go up and sit in a ship' is a pure Syriac expression. Sometimes you get 'sit in the sea' for 'embark'" (Mk 4^1, the original here). This superfluous *καθῆσθαι* is rather like the pleonasms quoted from Dalman on pp. 14 ff. Of course the recognition of this as translation Greek does not affect the grammatical category in which we place *ἐμβάντα*.

Since I have not given a chapter to Conjunctions, I may put at the end of these addenda a note upon a use of *ἀλλά* which has excited much discussion. In Mt 20^{23} some have translated *ἀλλά* "except," as if = *εἰ μή* or *πλήν*. Against this both Winer and his editor (p. 566) speak very decisively: thus, the latter says, "Even in Mk 4^{22} *ἀλλά* is simply *but* (but rather), not *save, except.*" I have a draft letter of his to a fellow-Reviser (dated 1871), in which he argues at length against the lax use of *ἀλλά*, which in Mt *l.c.* "would be equivalent to supplying *ἐμόν ἐστι δοῦναι* in the second clause." Blass does not allude to the latter passage, but on Mk *l.c.* (p. 269) he says *ἀλλ'* = *εἰ μή* "save that." It is certainly difficult here to separate the *ἀλλά* from the *ἐὰν μή* which stands in the parallel clause. I am very unwilling to challenge an opinion held so strongly after careful study; but the discovery of Tb P 104 (i/B.C.) makes me ready to believe that the note in WM might have been altered under stress of new evidence. *Καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκωι γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπολλωνίαν* must call for a sense of *ἀλλά* very near to *εἰ μή*. That supplements may be contrived we may allow, though they are often far from simple; but is there adequate motive for straining the natural meaning of the phrase? In Gen 21^{26} *οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα ἀλλὰ σήμερον*, the *ἀλλά* actually translates בִּלְתִּי, *except*. In Mt *l.c.*, it may well be that the AV or RV supplement is correct. But I cannot feel at all sure of this; and it seems moreover that the meaning need not be affected by reading *ἀλλά* as = *εἰ μή*. In Jn 15^4, Lk $4^{26f.}$, Ac 27^{22}, Gal 2^{16}, Rev 21^{27}, etc., we are familiar with the brachylogy—essentially akin to zeugma—which makes *εἰ μή* and the like = *but only*: why not apply this to *ἀλλά*? This would mean that only the thought of *δοῦναι* was carried on, and not that of *ἐμόν* as well. (Cf now Wellh. 24 in support of my position: also cf Kuhring, p. 49.)

The study of Wellhausen's illuminating forty pages increases my regret that I can only refer to them generally in notes inserted at the last revision. My argument in chapter i. is not affected by Wellhausen's exposition; but had his book come into my hands earlier, I should have taken care to emphasise more clearly what is said above concerning "translation Greek," and the tendency to over-use a correct vernacular idiom where it exactly or nearly translates an Aramaic original. Wellhausen rightly warns us against denying Aramaism because we can scrape together one or two parallels from holes and corners of Greek writing. That was the error of the old Purists, and we must be on our guard. But if we neo-Hellenists need to be careful, Wellhausen's criticisms of Dalman show that the neo-Semitists want watching as well. It is necessary in studying Wellhausen to remember that he only professes to speak from the Semitist's side: his φραγγελοῦν (*bis*) on p. 10 and ἑαυτός and ἀλλήλοι on p. 30 illustrate his limitation—*non omnia possumus omnes!* Space forbids our mentioning more than one further feature of his work, the great importance of his treatment of the Bezan text. He shows that D in a large number of places stands distinctly nearer the Aramaic which underlies the Synoptic records. If this is proved, we have manifestly taken a large step towards the solution of our great textual question. Let me finally quote his dictum that Mk is tolerably free from Hebraisms, *i.e.* pieces of translation Greek due to the LXX: Mk is however richest in Aramaisms, which Mt and Lk have largely pruned away Of course Wellhausen's argument has no bearing on free Greek in the NT.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE SECOND EDITION.

P. 3.—To anticipate a possible objection, I may say that the evidence for large Jewish settlements in Egypt from an early date is indisputable: see for example Mahaffy's and Th. Reinach's contributions to *Mélanges Nicole* (pp. 619 ff., 451 ff.). Mahaffy speaks of Aramaic trade documents in Upper Egypt from the time of Xerxes down. So far, however, no "Hebraist" has tried to use this fact to discount the deductions of Deissmann from the papyri; and I need not meet the argument before it arises. (See Preface, p. xvi. f.)

Ib.—The Rev. J. Pulliblank sends me an interesting extract from his notes of Bishop Lightfoot's lectures in 1863. Speaking of some NT word which had its only classical authority in Herodotus, he said, "You are not to suppose that the word had fallen out of use in the interval, only that it had not been used in the books which remain to us: probably it had been part of the common speech all along. I will go further, and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without any thought of being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the NT generally."

P. 5.—A very striking testimony may be cited from Cicero, *Pro Archia*, 23:—Nam si quis minorem gloriae fructum putat ex Graecis versibus percipi quam ex Latinis, vehementer errat, propterea quod Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur.

P. 14.—To the exx. of εἰς ἀπάντησιν c. gen. may be added two (one of them εἰς συναντ.) from the Pelagia stories (*Legenden der hl. Pelagia*, ed. Usener), pp. 19, 22. The documents are written in excellent vernacular, which does not seem open to the charge of being merely modelled on the biblical Greek.

P. 19.—Dr Marcus Dods finds a weak spot in my parallel, in that Greek was generally "not the vernacular, but a second language acquired for commercial or social purposes. The real parallel would therefore be the English-speaking Hindu, or semi-Americanised German or Pole, or the pidgin-English-speaking Chinaman, or bilingual Highlander or Welshman." So Dr Nestle. I have modified the form of the parallel accordingly, and I think it will now stand. The Hindu and the Welshman, "*granted a tolerable primary education*" in English, will not show much difference in their written dialect.

P. 22.—A reviewer in the *Athenaeum*, to whom I am greatly indebted, criticises my attitude towards the translation of Pallis. (So far from "strongly objecting," Mr Pallis prefers to be so styled, and not as Palli.) I cannot go into detail, but I would make two or three notes. (1) The Reviewer expresses the "shock" which even a foreigner experiences in finding Christ's speeches "abounding in Turkish words." Mr Pallis gives me a list of all the foreign words in his version of Mt, some two dozen in all, and not a quarter of them Turkish. This accusation of bringing in foreign words has been freely made by many on mere hearsay. (2) A lover of Hellenism can feel nothing but sympathy for the modern Greeks' national pride in their language. But whether Greek artisans can repeat the NT Greek by heart or no, it is abundantly proved that they cannot *understand* it; and that is sufficient justification for a popular version. (3) The general question of the Purist movement tempts discussion; but it has only one side which is relevant for this book. If the movement only concerned the abolition of *foreign words*, the NT grammarian could quote Purist as readily as popular Greek. But the καθαρεύουσα is an artificial language in its *grammar*, and it is therefore obviously useless when we are seeking scientific evidence bearing on ancient Hellenistic. The strongest sympathiser with Purism as a national movement would have to admit that for such purposes as ours the faintest suspicion of artificiality makes MGr valueless: nothing but the unschooled speech of the people can help us here.

P. 23.—On the use of the term Κοινή Prof. Thumb observes that the grammarians were far from consistent with themselves. A definition like κοινὴ διάλεκτος ᾗ πάντες χρώμεθα is not far from our present use; and even if the term be historically incorrect it is a pity to banish from science so well-established and pregnant a word (*Neue Jahrbücher f. d. klass. Altertum*, 1906, p. 262).

P. 32.—Dr W. H. D. Rouse, who has an exceptionally intimate first-hand knowledge of modern Greece, especially in the more out-of-the-way parts, tells me he thinks it too sweeping an assertion to say that the old dialects died out completely, except for what they contributed to the Κοινή. He has heard the broad ā in Calymnos, and καὶ πόκα in Cos. In the lecture just quoted (*Neue Jahrb.* 1906, p. 256), Prof. Thumb gives some interesting survivals of old dialectic forms in Cyprus, which he has noticed in the curse-tablets of Audollent. We have in fact to remember that the dialects existing within the Κοινή were partly or even mainly characterised by the survivals from the old local dialect which the levelling process failed to destroy.

P. 34.—A good illustration of my point that dialectic differences very largely lay in pronunciation is found in Dr Rouse's remark that "a [modern] Athenian, a Lesbian and an Astypaliote all will write καί, while they pronounce it respectively *kyé*, *čé*, *tsé*."

P. 36.—The case of τέσσαρες acc. ought not to be left without remarking that this is isolated, as the only early cardinal which ever had a separate acc. form. In the first 900 of Wilcken's ostraka I find 42 exx. of the indeclinable, and 29 of τέσσαρας, which shows how this form predominated in business language before 200 A.D. In the same documents I find *τέσσερας* and *τεσσεράκοντα* only once each (both ii/A.D.): cf p. 46 above.

Ib.—A "probably Ptolemaic" ostrakon in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 185 (E. J. Goodspeed), has *φιλανθροπίᾳ* and *δόσις* (=*δώσεις*) to add for the early confusion of *ο* and *ω*; *κατὰ μῆναν* (see p. 49) and *μηδενὶ δοῖς* (p. 55 n.³) evidence the writer's scanty culture. Earlier still is *λογευώντων* HbP 77 (249 B.C.), and cf Par P 40 (ii/B.C.). See Mayser, pp. 98 f., 139.

P. 38.—The point about *κόρη* needs perhaps to be stated less concisely. Brugmann makes it probable that in early Attic, as in its sister dialect Ionic, *ᾱ* became *η* universally, but that in Attic *ιη* and *ρη* (*ὑγιῆ*, *πρήττω*) broadened into *ιᾱ*, *ρᾱ*, whenever the *η* did not arise from a pre-Greek *ē*: this *ē* long maintained a different quality. But this specially Attic power of *ρ* became obsolete while *κόρϝη* was still pronounced with digamma.

P. 41.—Thumb (*op. cit.* 260) holds out hopes that we may get some not inconsiderable help in dating and localising textual types from such peculiarities as the confusion of tenuis, aspirata and media in Egypt and Further Asia, and that of *e* and *i* sounds in Asia Minor and Syria.

P. 44.—Among the irregular aspirations might have been given *οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς* (Gal 2^{14} ℵ*ACP 17 37). Here the *οὐχί* of BD* *al* probably helps us; a repetition of the *ι* after *οὐκ* would lead to the correction *οὐχί* and this to *οὐχ* by the dropping of the same letter. This seems simpler than Lightfoot's explanation from the Hebrew initial ``ה', which would not explain *οὐχ ἰδού* (B *decies* in 3 K, says Mr Thackeray).

P. 48.—Usener, *Pelagia*, p. 50, quotes *ἡ Ἱεροσόλυμα* from two MSS of xi/A.D. In the same book we find the vocative *κύρι* twice (p. 14—see Usener's note, p. 34). An additional early ex. of this shortening of *-ιο-* nouns may be found in a Ptolemaic ostrakon in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 184, *συνψέλειν* (*i.e.* *-ιον*). (The document has the word *κράβατος*, so spelt.) See Mayser 260.

P. 49.—The NT forms *συγγενίς* and *συγγενεῦσι* (WH *App*² 165) are both cited by Thumb from Asia Minor (*JHS* xxii. 358 and *BCH* xxiv. 339). Mayser cites *συγγενέα*: *per contra* *συγγενέσι* occurs Tb P 61 (ii/B.C.) *al.* So we have double forms, *ἐσθῆσιν* OP 466 and *ἐσθήσεσι* (as NT) BU 16, both ii/A.D.

P. 59.—An apparent false concord in B, *περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδεν δυνάμεων* (Lk 19^{37}), is corrected by Prof. Burkitt from the Old Syriac, which shows that *δυνάμεων* is a mere gloss. B accordingly shows the first stage of corruption, while D (*γεινομένων*) shows an independent gloss, and the other MSS present a completely regularised text. (The textual phenomena here are most instructive: cf what is quoted from Wellhausen about B and D, p. 242.) Note that in MGr *πᾶσα* survived *πᾶς*, as *πᾶσα ἕνας* "every one."

Ib.—For indeclinable *τι* Dr Rouse reminds me of the MGr *κἄτι*, as *κἄτι ἡσυχία*, "a little rest."

P. 60.—Mr Ottley calls my attention to Is 37^{38}, where it is very hard to resist the impression that an *accusative* stands for a genitive in apposition to an indeclinable.

Ib.—A better account of *ἡ θεός* in Ac 19^{37} is given by G. Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander und das NT* (Göttingen, 1905), pp. 10 f. He notes that the classical *ἡ θεός* often appears in Magnesian inscriptions to describe the great goddess of the city, while other people's goddesses were *θεαί*, the usual *Κοινή* term. The town clerk is accordingly using the technical term, as we might expect. Plentiful quotations are given by Nachmanson, p. 126. We may therefore keep Blass's comment on Luke's accuracy, but apply it in a different way.

P. 63.—It might be added that before ἐν disappeared it was often used for εἰς, just as εἰς was for ἐν. Thus in the late gloss at Jn 5^4; also four times in Tob, as Mr Thackeray notes, adding that it is a feature of the LXX in Jd—4 K. Cf in *Pelagia*, ἀνήλθομεν ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ (i. 4), ἀπήλθαμεν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ (i. 5), ἔφυγον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι (ii. 1). Some further quotations for late uses of ἐν will be found in Kuhring, pp. 43 f.

Ib.—On ὥραν (Jn 4^{52}, Ac 10^{30} *al*) see Usener, *Pelagia* 50, and Abbott *JG* 75, who suggests that the change from vernacular acc. to dat., Jn $4^{52f.}$, is brought in to denote *exact* time.

P. 64.—For χρᾶσθαι c. acc. add Wis 7^{14} (B—so RV), and *Syll.* 653^{62} (καταχρ.). The Purist Kontos (Γλωσσικαὶ Παρατηρήσεις, Athens, 1882, p. 420) complains of writers who used καταχρᾶσθαι (and even ἕπεσθαι !) with gen. As early as ii/A.D. we find a chiliarch of a Thracian cohort writing Ὡρίωνος (*i.e.* -ι) χαίρειν (Wilcken, *Ostr.* ii. 927): so σὺν Μηνοφίλου *ib.* 240 (same date). See Ramsay *CR* iii. 332.

P. 66.—On the construction of ἀκούω, γεύομαι, and προσκυνῶ, see Abbott, *JG* 76–78.

P. 70.—Dr Rouse compares with this nominative in time-expressions Aeschines' νὺξ ἐν μέσῳ καὶ παρῆμεν (*In Ctes.* 71).

P. 71.—On the threefold πατήρ in Jn 17, see Abbott *JG* 96 f.

P. 72.—A full study of prepositions replacing the simple gen. may be found in Kuhring, *Praepos.* 11 ff., 20. Dr Rouse notes that ἀπό is regularly used in partitive sense now: δῶσε μου ἀπὸ τοῦτο, "give me some of that."

P. 75.—For ἔρχομαί σοι I should have quoted the well-known line of Aeschylus (*PV* 358), ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος.

P. 76.—Reference should have been made to Eph 5^5, ἴστε γινώσκοντες, where Dean Robinson assumes Hebraism, comparing 1 Sam 20^3, γινώσκων οἶδεν, Jer 42 $(49)^{22}$, ἴστε (imper.) γινώσκοντες ὅτι (Symmachus). So RV. If this be so, we can only suppose Paul definitely citing OT language, just as a preacher using the archaic phrase "Know of a surety" would be immediately recognised as quoting. (It may be noted that if ἴστε is indic. it is a purely *literary* word, such as Paul is not very likely to have used: it would be less improbable in Heb 12^{17}. But in these places and Jas 1^{19} the imper. seems better, somewhat in the sense of the common classical εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι, "you may be sure": see LS *s.v.* οἶδα 7.) It is, however, at least as probable that we are to separate the verbs and read "For you must be assured of this (the following), recognising for yourselves that . . ." So E. Haupt, Salmond, and T. K. Abbott.

P. 79.—Dr E. A. Abbott (*Joh. Gram.* 510) makes it seem probable that the Leyden papyrus is *quoting* from Jn 1^{15}. He would translate πρῶτός μου "my Chief." See pp. 11–14 for his exposition, which brings in several harmonics beside the main note. I am not yet disposed to give up the view defended in the text. If Dr Abbott takes away one parallel, he gives me two new ones instead, in the quotations from scholiasts on Euripides; and his exegesis seems open to the charge of over-subtlety. Moreover, the Aelian passage, οἱ πρῶτοί μου ταῦτα ἀνιχνεύσαντες (*N.A.* viii. 12), is closely parallel for Jn 15^{18}; and the doubts as to the reading expressed by the Thesaurus editor here and in Plutarch, *Cato Minor* § 18 (οὔτε πρῶτός τις ἀνέβη . . . Κατῶνος οὔτε ὕστερος ἀπῆλθε), only mean that a modern scholar thought πρῶτος incorrect, which is undeniable. I am tempted to claim that Dr Abbott has proved my point for me.

P. 80.—I must confess to a rather serious oversight in omitting to discuss the "Hebraistic" use of πᾶς with negative in the sense of οὐδείς. In *CR* xv. 442, xviii. 155, I quote a number of exx. of πᾶς with prepositions and adjectives of negative meaning: thus ἄνευ or χωρὶς πάσης ὑπερθέσεως, a recurrent formula, ἀνυπεύθυνοι παντὸς ἐπιτίμου Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.), δίχα πάσης ἐξουσίας Plutarch *Cons. ad Uxor.* 1 (cf Heb 7^{7}). Closely allied to this is the Κοινή use of τις with negative, as μηδεμιᾶς κρατήσεως μηδὲ κυριείας τινὸς ἐγγαίου περιγινομένης αὐτῶι TP 1 (ii/B.C.), which has analogues in MGr (Jannaris *HG* § 1449 *c*). This was accordingly claimed as "a very slight extension of a vernacular usage under the encouragement of a similar idiom in Hebrew." It is found not only in presumed translation, as Mk 13^{20}, but in Paul, as Eph 5^{5}.

Ib.—Mr J. B. Shipley sends me an ingenious suggestion that ἑπτά arose from a gloss, Σκευᾶ = שֶׁבַע = ἑπτά.

Ib.—In Gal $1^{6f.}$ Ramsay maintains against Lightfoot that ἕτερος when definitely contrasted with ἄλλος denotes specific difference against generic, "another of the same kind," against "another of a different kind." Space precludes examination of his classical exx.; but it must not be too hastily assumed that Lightfoot is wrong. Abbott *JG* 611 supports him against Blass.

P. 86.—Add Hb P 44 (253 B.C.), δρῶντες . . . ὤιμην as an early ex.

P. 87.—The reciprocal εἷς τὸν ἕνα (1 Th 5^{11}) may be noted, with the MGr ὁ ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον. (Dr Rouse tells me the Purists say ἔσφαξε ὁ μὲν τὸν δέ!!)

Ib.—On "exhausted ἴδιος" see now Kuhring, *Praep.* 13.

P. 89.—Dr Marcus Dods criticises my treatment of ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοΐ, remarking that the danger was of a man's being "assured by some other person's convictions." That is, of course, quite true, but I think my statement holds that the phrase simply lays stress on the personal pronoun—"let each man be fully assured *for himself*."

P. 96.—Note that δώδεκα greatly predominates over δέκα δύο in ostraka.

P. 102.—In Kuhring's account of ἀπό (*Praep.* 35 ff., 52 ff.) there is striking evidence of the encroachments of this preposition. The common commercial ἔσχον ἀπὸ (for παρὰ) σοῦ may save us from over-refining in 1 Co 11^{23}. The note as to the perplexing rarity in the papyri of ἀπό with the agent after passive verbs will prevent us from assuming it too readily in the NT, though its occasional presence is undoubted. For οὐαὶ . . . ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων (Mt 18^{7}) I may quote excellent parallels from *Pelagia*, ὢ βία ἀπὸ τοῦ . . . λήρου τούτου (Usener, pp. 11 *bis*, 27), and ὢ ἀπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν (p. 28): the difference in the interjection shows that this was not imitation. Usener (p. 44) notes ὢ βία "Murder!" as a vernacular phrase. So *Acta Thomae*, p. 224, ὢ ἀπὸ τοῦ δολίου. It is simply the classical ὤ c. gen. (cf *Ep. Diogn.* 9 ὢ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας), with the gen. strengthened, as so often. Ἐκ of material (as Mt 27^{29}) Kuhring only finds once, AP 99 (ii/A.D.): add *Mél. Nicole*, p. 281, περιτραχηλίδιον ἐκ καθορμίων λιθινῶν, "a necklace made of strings of stones" (iii/B.C.). As to the survival of ἐκ to-day authorities differ: the *Athenaeum* reviewer cites among others Psichari, who says of ἐκ τόν, "C'est bel et bien une forme vivante."

P. 103.—There seem to be places where εἰς actually stands for the possessive genitive, as Deissmann *BS* 117 f. shows it does for the dative: TbP 16 οὐ λήγοντες τῆι (for τῆς!) [εἰς] αὐτοὺς αὐθαδίᾳ, "not desisting from *their* violent behaviour" (ii/B.C.); χωρὶς τοῦ εἰς αὐτὴν οἴκου (=ου) Par P 5, "*her* house" (*ib.*). It is tempting to seek help here for 1 Pet 1^{11}, but the illiteracy of the documents must be remembered.

P. 106.—One more quotation should be made from Kuhring, whose pamphlet must be constantly in our hands as we study the NT prepositions. He seems to demolish even the solitary Hebraism I had left to μετά, that in Lk 1^{58}. AP 135 (ii/A.D.) has τί δὲ ἡμεῖν συνέβη μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων; "What befell us in connexion with the magistrates?" (G. and H.). So also BU 798 (Byz.).

Kontos (Παρατηρήσεις 409 ff.) fiercely attacks *πολεμῶ μετά τινος*, "fight *with*," *i.e.* "against"; but he is at least eighteen centuries late.

Ib.—One force of *παρά* in composition is noted by Thumb (*Neue Jahrb.* '06, p. 249), with reference to *παρῆλθεν* in Mt 14^{15}. He parallels Wellhausen's "vorgerückt" (our "*advanced*") by citing MGr *παραπάνω*, "far over," *παρακάτω*, "far under," *παραμέσα*, "far in." Another force is exemplified in *παραπίπτω*, which Wilcken (*Ostraka*, i. 78 f.) illustrates as a commercial word, giving Mommsen's "ungültig werden, etwa wegen eines Formfehlers." He compares Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 4, and Polybius, xviii. 36. 6, where it is co-ordinated with *ἀγνοεῖν*, = *παραπίπτειν τῆς ἀληθείας*.

P. 110.—To the weighty authorities for *ἔχομεν* in Rom 5^1 is now added Prof. H. A. A. Kennedy: see *ExpT* for July 1906, p. 451. I still agree with SH.

P. 112.—Usener (*Pelagia*, 49) remarks on *ἀπέρχομαι* that in later Greek it is transferred to the thought of the goal. Thus *ἀπήλθαμεν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ* = "we *arrived* at the great church." *Ἀφικνοῦμαι* was much earlier in showing this result of perfective *ἀπό*.

P. 115.—In *Neue Jahrb.* 1906, pp. 254 ff., Prof. Thumb justifies his view that Miss Purdie's general position is right, though pure Κοινή texts like the NT and the papyri would have served better than a writer like Polybius, belonging to a transition period of the language. He points out that by this development of the prepositions Hellenistic gains the means of expressing aoristic *Aktionsart* in present time. Thus "*ἀπέχουσι* (Mt $6^{2.\,5.\,16}$) is in its *Aktionsart* identical with *ἔλαβον* or *ἔσχον*, that is, it is an aorist-present, which denotes the present answering to *λαβεῖν* or *σχεῖν*." The recognition of punctiliar force in this commercial word (see Deissmann *BS* 229 and *Licht v. Osten* 74 ff.) makes it very vivid in Mt *l.c.*. the hypocrites have as it were their money down, as soon as their trumpet has sounded.

P. 122.—Mr H. D. Naylor sends me some additional notes as to the *μὴ ποίει* canon. Some of his classical exx. against Dr Headlam are very good: note Aristoph. *Av.* 1534, where the *conative* present seems clear, and *Ran.* 618–622. Mr Naylor remarks, "I venture to hold the view that the distinction is a growth. It was beginning in classical times; it was nearly crystallised in NT Greek; and it is completely so in the modern language." In other words, usage progressively restricted the various possible forces of *ποίει* in this locution, till only one was left. Mullach treated the matter well (pp. 345 f.), as the *Athenaeum* reviewer notes. Add to my papyrus reff. HbP 45 (iii/B.C.) *καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πειρᾶσθε συνάγειν καὶ μὴ ὑπολιμπάνεσθε*.

P. 129.—The present of this conative *ἠνάγκαζον* is well seen in Gal 6^{12}: cf also Jn 10^{32}. With reference to Thumb's argument on *προσφέρω*, I find it easier to deny him Heb 11^{17}, as I can give him a good ex. in a less literary writer: *πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρον* in Mt 5^{24} is very probably aorist in action.

Ib.—The differentia of the aorist may be effectively brought in to decide the famous difficulty in 1 Co 7^{21}. If Paul meant "go on in your slavery," he must have said *χρῶ*: the aorist *χρῆσαι* can only be "seize the opportunity." We can now see that Origen took the passage this way: see *JTS* ix. 508.

P. 134.—For Jn 15^6 Epictetus iv. 1. 39, *ἂν μὲν στρατεύσωμαι, ἀπηλλάγην πάντων τῶν κακῶν*. 1 Co 7^{28} and Gal 5^4 may be noted. See Abbott *JG* 586 for other exx.

P. 135.—An idiomatic old aorist belonging to this category still survives: a traveller in Cos "had a pleasant shock, on calling for a cup of coffee, to hear the waiter cry Ἔφθασα."

P. 141.—In a discussion of aorist and perfect (*Am. Journ. Theol.* x. 102 f.), in which Latinism is regarded as contributory to the fusion, E. J. Goodspeed remarks on the curious development in the formulæ with the verb *διαγράφω*, "pay," in receipts. The Ptolemaic documents have *διαγέγραφεν*, the early Roman *διαγεγράφηκεν*. Then in twelve years, towards the end of i/A.D., the aorist suddenly and completely ousts the perfect, having previously only appeared once, cir. 40 A.D., and the change occurs simultaneously in Elephantine and Thebes. It affects no other words: *μεμέτρη-μαι* and *-κεν* continue unchanged.

P. 142.—Mr Ottley has noted no case of aoristic perfect in Isaiah except in the category of aorist and perfect standing together, joined by *καί*.

Ib.—Gal 3^{18} 4^{23} are Pauline exx. of the perfect for what "stands written."

P. 145.—The constative "we possessed" clearly will not suit *ἐσχήκαμεν* in Rom 5^{2}. Can it have been a mannerism which Paul dropped between the writing of "3 Corinthians" and Romans? On the other hand, another papyrus can be quoted where "possessed" suits the sense well, and the perfect stands in close connexion with the aorist: BU 297 (end of ii/A.D.), *τοῖς δικαίαν αἰτίαν ἐσχηκόσι καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς ἀμφισβητήσεως ἐν τῇ νομῇ γενομένους* (= *-οις*).

Ib.—I venture to question the rendering "began to amend" in Jn 4^{52}. The idiomatic English "got better" suits the punctiliar *ἔσχεν*, and the comparative does not differ from the positive in *ἐὰν κομψῶς σχῶ*, TbP 414 (ii/A.D.), more than "got better" differs from "got well." The father does not suggest a *gradual* recovery.

P. 159.—On the verb *παρέχω*=pay, Wilcken observes (*Ostraka*, i. 107) that even in RL (iii/B.C.)—*e.g.* 51—the word occurs often both in act. and in mid. without apparent distinction. These sporadic exx. of irregular middles occur in the earliest period of the *Κοινή*, but they do not invalidate the general rule.

P. 168.—The papyrus exx. of *ὅταν*=*when* make it an open question whether in Mk 11^{19} we are not to translate "when evening fell," that is the evening before the *πρωΐ* of v.^{20}. In such a writer as Mk this is at least possible, and the other rendering produces an awkward sequence. The impf. *ἐξεπορεύοντο* may be pictorial quite as well as iterative.

P. 177.—Prof. W. Rhys Roberts suggests to me another ex. of *μή* c. fut. in Eurip. *Med.* 822, *λέξεις δὲ μηδέν* . . ., where the change to *λέξῃς* (especially in that order) has always seemed to him arbitrary. "Probably there are other similar cases in which the MS reading should be carefully weighed."

P. 179.—Add Epict. iv. 1. 41, *ἵνα μὴ μωρὸς ᾖ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μάθῃ*, "let him not be a fool, but learn. . . ." Dr J. O. F. Murray suggests to me that this *ἵνα* may be seen in Rev 14^{13}. Since the jussive *Requiescant* falls from Divine lips, it has no bearing on controverted questions. Its superior fitness in the grammatical structure of the verse is undeniable. In 1 Co 14^{5} we have a good ex. of *θέλω ἵνα* and *θέλω* c. inf. side by side with no real difference.

Ib.—Prof. Burkitt (*Evang. da-Mepharr.* ii. 252 f.) reads in M. 23^{23} *ταῦτα δὲ ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι*, after the Lewis, supposing the MSS readings to be corrections. In 2 Co 12^{1} he would follow ℵ in reading *καυχᾶσθαι—οὐ συμφέρον μὲν—ἐλεύσομαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, which is presumably "Now to boast!—it is not expedient, but I shall be coming," etc. There seems no special difficulty about infin. for imper. here, and Aramaism is entirely out of court. Prof. Burkitt's reading in Mt *l.c.* is "translation Greek" no doubt, but perfectly allowable.

P. 185.—The use of *μή* in warning retains still the consciousness of its paratactic origin. Dr. Rouse quotes *φοβοῦμαι μήπως ἀπέθανε* (cf Gal 4^{11}, 2 Co 11^{3}) with the independent *μήπως* in questions expressing surprise or indignation (*μήπως εἶμαι λόρδος*; "do you suppose I'm a millionaire?") (Mullach, pp. 395 f.).

Ib.—In Gal 6^{10} WH read *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν* (ℵB*17). As we have seen on Rom 5^{1}, the MSS can hardly perhaps be regarded as decisive between *ο* and *ω*;

but the subj. is justifiable with the sense "as long as we have opportunity, let us continue to work." (Ὡς in MGr takes the meaning of ἕως as well as its own.) In classical Greek this futuristic subj. would demand ἄν, but words meaning *until* constantly drop it in Hellenistic.

P. 188.—Dr Giles tells me that Gildersleeve's suggestion of an independent οὐ in οὐ μή was anticipated in the Middle Ages: in one if not both of the best MSS of Aristophanes it is regularly punctuated οὔ· μή. . . .

P. 205.—Prof. Thumb (*Neue Jahrb.* '06, p. 259) observes that the infin. of purpose is commoner in Homer than in Attic: the preference accordingly has lingered in Asiatic and island Greek for three thousand years.

P. 206.—Dr E. A. Abbott reinforces the depleted ranks of scholars who would press the telic force of ἵνα in Jn. We might cite such passages as 15^{13} as affording scope for exegetical ingenuity on these lines. If we had no evidence from Hellenistic and MGr as to the loss of this force in ἵνα, we might accept such subtleties of interpretation as at least not out of character with so allusive a writer. But with our present knowledge we need much stronger evidence to prove that Jn differed so greatly from his contemporaries.

P. 207.—Prof. Burkitt notes (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 183) that Tatian took ὥστε as consecutive in Lk 4^{29}, "so that they cast him down."

P. 209.—The consecutive ὅτι which Blass would read in Jn 3^{16} does appear in later Greek, *e.g. Pelagia*, 20, τί διδοῖς τοῖς ἀμνοῖς σου, ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχουσιν; See Abbott *JG* 534.

P. 210.—The consecutive use of ἵνα was recognised by Lightfoot in Gal 5^{17}, 1 Th 5^{4}: see his notes, and cf what he says on εἰς τὸ c. inf. in 1 Th 2^{16}.

P. 212.—For classical exx. of acc. and infin. where nom. would have been regular, cf Aeschylus *PV* 268 f. and the note of Sikes and Wynne-Willson; also Adam's note on Plato *Apol.* 36 B.

P. 215.—Dr Abbott touches a weak spot in my treatment of ἐν τῷ c. inf. He reminds me that, to prove the Biblical use free from Semitism, we must find classical parallels for it with the sense "during." Birklein's statistics unfortunately do not give us the opportunity of testing this, and in the face of Blass's dictum (p. 239) it is not worth while to try. I should transfer this "Hebraism" to the category of "possible but unidiomatic" Greek (*supra*, p. 76).

Ib.—Ζῆν, like πεῖν and φαγεῖν, our *living*, had become a noun in the vernacular. Thus BM iii. p. 131 (a poor weaver's petition, 140 A.D.) μισθοῦ πορίζοντος τὸ ζῆν, TbP 283 (illiterate, i/B.C.) κινδυνεύωι τῶι ζῆν, *al.*

P. 227.—The periphrastic imperf. occurs several times in *Pelagia*, as p. 14, ἤμην ἀπερχόμενος; 18, ἦν ἀκούσασα: note also p. 26, ἔσο γινώσκων, like ἴσθι εὐνοῶν in Mt 5^{25}. Cf Usener's note p. 50. That this is pure vernacular, untainted by Hebraism, is beyond question. Dr Rouse observes that it is used now in Zaconian, as φοροῦντερ ἔμε = ἐφοροῦμεν, ὁρούμενερ ἔμι = ὁρῶμαι.

P. 237.—A further addition to the list on p. 95 is given by Prof. Burkitt in Mt 10^{11} D and 28, ἡ πόλις εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσέλθητε εἰς αὐτήν (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 75). This goes with the passages supporting Wellhausen's thesis (above, p. 242).

P. 240.—If μὴ γένοιτο is "a phrase of learned origin," it is presumably parallel with some other survivals in idiomatic phrases, for which Dr Rouse instances μετὰ χαρᾶς, ἀπὸ βροχῆς, τέλος πάντων, τῷ ὄντι, παντάπασι. Dr Rouse himself has never heard μὴ γένοιτο, for which the people say ὁ θεὸς νὰ φυλάξῃ.

I. INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

(*a*) New Testament.

MATTHEW

PAGE
1. 18 . . . 74
1. 19 . . . 230
1. 20 . . . 124
1. 21 . . 69, 86
1. 22 . . . 106
2. 1 . . . 48
2. 2 . . 138, 204
2. 3 . . . 48
2. 4 . . . 120
2. 10 . . . 117
2. 15 . . . 138
2. 20 . . . 58
2. 23 . . . 17
3. 4 . . 91, 102
3. 7 . . 116, 138
3. 9 . . 15, 124
3. 11 . . . 208
3. 14 . . . 129
3. 17 . . . 104
4. 3 . . . 208
5. 12 . . 129, 174
5. 17 . . . 138
5. 18 . . 58, 191
5. 21, etc. 138, 140, 186
5. 25 . . 174, 226
5. 26 . . . 191
5. 27 . . . 138
5. 28 . 65, 140, 218
5. 29 . . . 210
5. 31 . . 138, 186
5. 33 . . . 138
5. 34, 36 . . 126
5. 38 . . . 138
5. 39 . . 79, 174
5. 40 . . . 69
5. 42 . . 129, 174
5. 43 . . . 138
5. 47 . . . 186
6. 2 . . 159, 186
6. 3 . . . 174
6. 11 . . 129, 174
6. 12 . . 137, 140
6. 13 . . . 125
6. 16 . . . 186

MATTHEW—*continued*

PAGE
6. 17 . . 85, 236
6. 19 . . 58, 240
6. 27 . . . 230
6. 28 . . . 117
7. 1 . . . 191
7. 4 . . 175, 176
7. 9 . . . 193
7. 13 . . . 174
7. 16 . . . 59
7. 22 . . . 138
7. 23 . . . 174
8. 1 . . . 74
8. 8 . . . 208
8. 10 . . . 140
8. 19 . . . 97
8. 25 . . . 114
8. 32 . . . 172
8. 34 . . . 14
9. 1 . . . 90
9. 8 . . . 58
9. 10 . . 16, 17
9. 18 . . 74, 140
9. 34 . . . 104
10. 5 . . . 138
10. 8 . . . 139
10. 9 . . . 125
10. 10 . . . 38
10. 19 . . . 93
10. 25 . 140, 208, 210
10. 26 . . . 191
10. 28 . . . 102
10. 29 . . . 236
10. 32 . . . 104
10. 34 f. . . . 138
10. 42 . . . 188
11. 1 . . . 17
11. 3 . . . 185
11. 6 . . . 104
11. 17 . . . 139
11. 20 . . . 79
11. 25 . 91, 136, 139
11. 27 . . . 140
12. 3, etc. . . 140
12. 7 . . . 148

MATTHEW—*continued*

PAGE
12. 28 . . . 140
12. 42 . . . 236
13. 2 . . 230, 241
13. 5–8 . . 79
13. 14 . . . 75
13. 15 . . . 140
13. 17 . . . 139
13. 24 . . . 140
13. 28 . . . 140
13. 30 . . . 97
13. 32 . . . 53
13. 44 . . . 139
13. 46 . 142, 143, 145
14. 2 . . . 140
14. 15 . . 140, 247
14. 19 . . . 107
15. 5 . . . 177
15. 6 . . . 140
15. 13 . . . 139
15. 24 . . . 138
15. 32 . . . 70
16. 7 . . . 139
16. 17 . . . 140
16. 20 . . . 208
16. 22 . 190, 191, 240
16. 26 . . . 230
17. 9 . . . 125
17. 12 . . 138, 140
17. 14 . . . 74
18. 1 . . . 78
18. 6 . . . 208
18. 11 . . . 137
18. 13 . . . 17
18. 15 . . . 140
18. 22 . . . 98
18. 23 . . 140, 160
18. 25 . . . 219
19. 6 . . . 140
19. 12 . . . 139
19. 27 . . . 140
19. 29 . . . 140
20. 7 . . . 140
20. 12 . . . 140
20. 20, 22 . . 160

MATTHEW—*continued*
PAGE
20. 22 . . . 45
20. 23 . . . 241
20. 28 . . . 105
21. 16 . . 138, 140
21. 19 . . . 179
21. 20 . . . 139
21. 32 . . . 216
21. 42 59, 138, 139, 140
22. 1 . . . 131
22. 2 . . . 140
22. 5 . . 88, 90
22. 11 . . 231, 232
23. 21 . . . 104
23. 23 . 140, 185, 248
23. 30 . . . 201
23. 33 . . 116, 185
23. 39 . . . 191
24. 17, 18 . . 174
24. 23 . . . 124
24. 30 . . . 150
24. 35 . . . 190
24. 43 . . . 201
24. 45 . . . 140
24. 48 . . . 142
25. 6 . . 14, 146
25. 9 . 184, 189, 192
25. 16 . . . 116
25. 19 . . . 160
25. 20 . . . 140
25. 20, 24 . . 238
25. 22 . . . 140
25. 24, 25 . . 238
25. 24, 26 . . 138
25. 40 . . . 138
25. 41 . . . 221
26. 2 . . . 120
26. 4 . . . 157
26. 10 . . 116, 140
26. 13 . . . 140
26. 24 . . . 200
26. 25 . . . 140
26. 32 . . . 212
26. 35 . . 190, 191
26. 50 . . . 93
26. 51 . . . 157
26. 53 . . . 50
26. 64 . . 86, 140
26. 65 . . . 140
27. 1 . . . 207
27. 4 . . 140, 177
27. 5 . . . 155
27. 11 . . . 86
27. 19 . . . 140
27. 19, 25 . . 183
27. 21 . . 77, 102
27. 23 . . . 140
27. 24 . . . 90
27. 32 . . . 14
27. 35 . . . 157
27. 40 . . . 127

MATTHEW—*continued*
PAGE
27. 44 . . . 58
27. 46 . . . 140
27. 49 . . 175, 230
27. 62 . . . 91
28. 1 . . 72, 73
28. 7 . . . 140
28. 15 . . . 139
28. 18 . . . 140
28. 20 . . . 139

MARK
1. 7 . . 95, 237
1. 11 . . . 134
1. 15 . . . 67
1. 17 . . . 45
1. 25 . . . 176
1. 36 . . . 116
1. 44 . . . 124
2. 1 . . . 82
2. 3 . . . 222
2. 5 . . . 119
2. 7 . . . 231
2. 15 . . 16, 17
2. 23 . 16, 17, 159
3. 9 . . . 208
3. 11 . . . 168
3. 16 . . 69, 235
3. 21 . . 106, 134
3. 26 . . . 187
4. 1 . . . 241
4. 5–8 . . . 79
4. 8 . . . 103
4. 22 . . 191, 241
4. 26 . . . 185
4. 28 . . 46, 50
4. 32 . . . 53
4. 39 . . . 176
4. 41 . . . 58
5. 10 . . . 208
5. 13 . . . 172
5. 15 . . . 145
5. 19 . . . 143
5. 23 . . . 179
5. 34 . . 174, 226
5. 36 . . . 124
6. 14, 24 . . 127
6. 17 f. . . . 94
6. 22–25 . . 160
6. 25 . . . 179
6. 26 . . . 51
6. 38 . . . 170
6. 39 f. . . 97, 107
6. 56 . . 167, 168
7. 12 . . . 191
7. 25 . . 13, 94, 95
7. 26 . . . 75
7. 28 . . . 139
8. 2 . . . 70
8. 3 . . . 53

MARK—*continued*
PAGE
8. 7 . . . 52
8. 14 . . . 170
8. 19 . . . 50
8. 24 . . . 94
8. 26 . . . 125
8. 36 . . . 87
9. 18 . . . 186
9. 25 . . . 125
9. 38 . . . 129
9. 39 . . 125, 174
9. 41 . . 100, 188
10. 7 . . . 91
10. 13 . . . 59
10. 20 . . . 159
10. 29 . . . 191
10. 32 . . . 227
10. 35, 38 . . 160
10. 35 . . . 179
10. 45 . . . 105
10. 51 . . . 179
11. 11 . . . 72
11. 14 . . 165, 179
11. 16 . . . 176
11. 19 . . 168, 248
11. 25 . . . 168
12. 11 . . . 59
12. 14 . . . 185
12. 23 . . . 145
12. 40 . . . 50
13. 1 . . . 74
13. 2 . . 189, 191
13. 6 . . . 175
13. 11 . . . 91
13. 13 . . . 150
13. 19 . . . 95
13. 24–27 . . 150
13. 31 . . 190, 191
14. 3 . . 55, 176
14. 6 . . . 175
14. 8 . . . 176
14. 10 . . . 97
14. 14 . . . 151
14. 18 . . . 111
14. 19 . . . 105
14. 21 . . 171, 200
14. 28 . . . 149
14. 30 . . . 151
14. 31 . . 190, 191
14. 32 . . . 169
14. 36 . . 93, 233
14. 38 . . . 178
14. 42 . . . 175
14. 47 . . . 157
14. 63 . . . 38
14. 72 . . . 131
15. 1 . . . 159
15. 2 . . . 86
15. 15 . . . 20
15. 18 . . . 71
15. 25 . . . 12

MARK—*continued*

PAGE
15. 36 . . . 175
15. 42 . . . 51
16. 6 . 135, 137, 163
[16.] 9–20 . . 216
[16.] 18 . . 191

LUKE

1. 7 . . 75, 103
1. 15 . . 177, 191
1. 18 . . . 75
1. 20 . . . 92
1. 28 . . . 183
1. 38 . . . 195
1. 43 . 208, 211, 217
1. 54, 72 . . 210
1. 58 . . 106, 246
1. 59 . . . 129
1. 62 . . . 198
1. 76 f. . . . 217
1. 79 . . . 217
2. 1 . . . 47
2. 1, 3 . . . 162
2. 4 . . 91, 212
2. 5 . . . 162
2. 26 . . . 169
2. 36 . . . 75
2. 39 . . . 130
2. 49 . . . 103
3. 8 . . . 15
3. 15 . . 194, 199
3. 16 . . 95, 237
3. 23 . . . 227
3. 23 ff. . . . 236
4. 10 . . . 116
4. 18 . . . 143
4. 25 . . . 60
4. 26 f. . . . 241
4. 33 . . . 227
4. 42 . . . 220
5. 19 . . . 73
5. 23 . . . 119
5. 38 . . . 222
6. 1 . . . 17
6. 3 . . . 168
6. 4 . . . 171
6. 11 . . . 198
6. 13 . . . 65
6. 23 . . 129, 174
6. 29 . 79, 125, 174
6. 30 . 119, 129, 174
6. 35 . . . 65
6. 37 . . . 191
6. 41 . . . 90
6. 42 . 175, 231, 232
7. 6 . . . 156
7. 13 . . . 125
7. 16 . . . 135
7. 19 f. . . . 80
7. 32 . . . 82

LUKE—*continued*

PAGE
8. 6–8 . . . 79
8. 27 . . . 75
8. 29 . 75, 113, 148
8. 38 . . . 54
8. 42 . . . 114
8. 43 . . . 102
8. 46 . . . 229
8. 49 . . 121, 125
8. 52 . . . 125
8. 54 . . . 70
9. 3 . . . 179
9. 13 . . 171, 187
9. 25 . . 87, 230
9. 28 . . . 70
9. 31 . . . 53
9. 36 . . 52, 144
9. 45 . . . 210
9. 46 . . . 198
9. 54 . . . 185
10. 1 . . . 97
10. 4 . . . 125
10. 7 . . 91, 125
10. 18 . . . 134
10. 20 . . . 125
10. 21 . . . 91
10. 36 . . . 146
10. 42 . . . 92
11. 3 . 129, 173, 174
11. 4 . . . 119
11. 7 . . . 125
11. 35 . . . 192
11. 41 f. . . 15
11. 46 . . . 56
12. 1 . . 102, 157
12. 2 . . . 191
12. 4 . . . 102
12. 8 . . . 104
12. 12 . . . 91
12. 15 . . 157, 178
12. 20 . . . 58
12. 24, 27 . . 117
12. 26 . . . 236
12. 32 . . . 70
12. 35 . . . 176
12. 36 . . . 74
12. 39 . . . 201
12. 58 . . . 174
12. 59 . . 55, 191
13. 8 . . . 169
13. 16 . . . 11
13. 24 . . . 174
13. 27 . . . 174
13. 34 . . . 45
13. 35 . . . 191
14. 7 . . . 157
14. 8 . . . 125
14. 12 . . . 125
14. 18 . . . 90
14. 20 . . . 135
14. 28 . . . 194

LUKE—*continued*

PAGE
15. 14 . . . 60
15. 17 . . . 114
15. 19 . . . 208
15. 26 . . . 198
15. 32 . . . 135
16. 17 . . . 191
16. 22 . . . 16
17. 1 . . . 217
17. 8 . . . 93
17. 23 . . . 59
18. 1 . . . 218
18. 2 . . . 65
18. 7 . . . 159
18. 10 . . . 205
18. 16 . . . 124
18. 36 . . . 198
18. 41 . . . 185
19. 2 . . . 86
19. 13 . . 35, 118
19. 17 . . 174, 226
19. 29 . . . 69
20. 16 . . 194, 240
20. 23 . . . 117
20. 36 . . . 114
21. 6 . . 69, 191
21. 8 . . . 125
21. 22 . . . 217
21. 33 . . 190, 191
21. 37 . . . 69
22. 6 . . . 220
22. 23 . . . 199
22. 34 . . . 239
22. 44 . . . 51
22. 49 . . 12, 185
22. 65 . . . 231
22. 70 . . . 86
23. 3 . . . 86
23. 5 . . 45, 240
23. 28 . . . 125
24. 22 . . . 51
24. 34 . . . 135
24. 47, 49 . . 182

JOHN

1. 5 . . . 158
1. 6 . . . 70
1. 9 . . . 227
1. 11 . . . 90
1. 12 . . . 115
1. 14 . . 50, 82, 83
1. 15 . 79, 147, 245
1. 16 . . . 100
1. 18 . . 144, 235
1. 27 . . 208, 237
1. 41 . . . 90
2. 5 . . . 186
2. 16 . . . 125
3. 7 . . 124, 126

JOHN—*continued*
PAGE
3. 16 . . . 209
3. 18 . . 171, 239
3. 19 . . . 140
3. 32 . . . 143
4. 10 . . . 201
4. 18 . . . 145
4. 23 . . . 66
4. 29 . . 170, 193
4. 34 . . 208, 210
4. 35 . . . 12
4. 52 . . . 63
5. 7 . . . 219
5. 13 . . . 210
5. 14 . . . 125
5. 18 . . . 90
5. 24 . . . 67
5. 36 . . . 49
5. 37 . . . 144
5. 38 . . . 67
6. 10 . . 63, 75
6. 25 . . . 146
6. 57 . . . 105
6. 59 . . . 236
6. 68 . . . 83
7. 4 . . . 212
[8. 9] . . . 105
8. 31 . . . 67
8. 32, 33 . . 149
8. 33 . . . 144
8. 38 . . . 85
8. 57 . . . 234
8. 59 . . 156, 161
9. 2 . . . 210
9. 17 . . . 94
10. 5 . . . 190
10. 12 . . 231, 232
10. 29 . . . 50
10. 37 . . . 125
11. 2 . . . 132
11. 17 . . . 36
11. 18 . . . 102
11. 21, 32 . . 201
11. 28 . . . 131
11. 42 . . . 135
11. 55 . . . 12
11. 56 . . . 191
12. 1 . . 100, 101
12. 7 . . . 175
12. 9 . . . 84
12. 13 . . . 14
12. 19 . . . 135
12. 35 . . . 158
12. 40 . . . 117
13. 1 . . 90, 135
13. 8 . . 177, 191
13. 13 . . . 235
13. 27 . . . 236
13. 31 . . . 135
14. 31 . . . 177
15. 4 . . 103, 241

JOHN—*continued*
PAGE
15. 6 . 59, 134, 247
15. 8, 13 . . 208
15. 13 . . . 211
15. 16 . . . 55
15. 18 . . 79, 245
15. 22, 24 . . 52
15. 27 . . . 119
16. 17 . . . 102
16. 23 . . . 66
17. 3 . . 113, 206
17. 23 . . . 234
17. 24 . . . 179
17. 25 . . . 113
18. 20 . . . 236
18. 34 . . . 87
18. 37 . . . 86
18. 39 . . . 210
19. 3 . . . 70
19. 11 . . . 148
19. 21 . . . 125
19. 24 . . . 157
19. 25 . . . 106
20. 1 . . . 222
20. 2 . . . 59
20. 17, 27 . . 125
20. 19 . . . 183
20. 25 . . 49, 191
21. 3 . . . 204
21. 5 . . . 170
21. 8 . . . 102
21. 10 . . . 135
21. 23 . . . 114
21. 24 . . . 9
21. 25 . . . 205

ACTS

1. 1 . . . 79
1. 5 . . . 21
1. 12 . 49, 69, 235
1. 15 . . . 107
1. 25 . . . 90
2. 1 . . . 233
2. 8 . . . 88
2. 17, 21 . . 16
2. 45 . . . 167
2. 47 . . . 107
3. 8 . . . 161
3. 12 . . . 217
3. 17 . . . 230
3. 19 . . . 218
3. 23 . . . 16
4. 5 . . . 16
4. 13 . . . 158
4. 16 . . . 236
4. 21 . . 212, 230
4. 23 . . . 90
4. 35 . . . 167
4. 36 . . . 75

ACTS—*continued*
PAGE
5. 2 . . . 237
5. 7 . 16, 70, 233
5. 14 . . 67, 68
5. 15 . . . 35
5. 17 . . . 228
5. 21 . . . 237
5. 24 . . . 198
5. 39 . . . 193
6. 3 . . . 50
6. 5 . . . 50
7. 5 . . 231, 232
7. 11 . . . 107
7. 12 . . . 235
7. 14 . . . 103
7. 20 . . . 104
7. 26 . . . 129
7. 31 . . . 117
7. 35 . . . 144
7. 36 . . . 133
7. 40 . . . 69
7. 60 . . . 125
8. 16 . . . 107
8. 20 . . . 195
8. 23 . . 71, 235
8. 31 . . . 198
9. 7 . . . 66
9. 15 . . . 217
9. 34 . . . 119
9. 38 . . . 125
10. 15 . . . 125
10. 17 . . . 198
10. 25 . . 16, 217
10. 28 . . . 236
10. 33 . . 131, 228
10. 37 . . . 240
11. 25 . . . 235
11. 28 . . 60, 92
12. 6 . . . 114
12. 17 . . . 240
12. 25 . . . 133
13. 1 . . . 228
13. 8 . . . 236
13. 9 . . . 83
13. 10 . . . 177
13. 22 . . . 71
13. 25 . . . 93
14. 6, 8 . . . 48
14. 8 . . . 221
14. 13 . . . 228
14. 14 . . . 157
14. 18 . . 217, 220
15. 17 . . . 237
15. 20 . . . 217
15. 23 . . . 179
15. 27 . . . 230
15. 29 . 171, 176, 228
15. 37 f. . . 130
15. 39 . . . 209
16. 6 . . 133, 134
16. 13 . . . 82

Acts—*continued*

PAGE

16. 18 . . 119, 240
16. 28 . . . 125
16. 34 . . 67, 235
16. 36 . . . 52
17. 1 . . . 230
17. 9 . . . 20
17. 18 . . . 198
17. 26 . . . 133
17. 27 . . . 230
17. 28 . . . 81
17. 31 . . . 240
18. 8 . . 67, 235
18. 9 . . . 125
19. 14 . . 80, 246
19. 15 . . . 131
19. 16 . . . 80
19. 26 . . . 73
19. 27 . . . 60
19. 28 . . . 50
19. 32 . . . 236
20. 3 . . . 217
20. 10 . . . 125
20. 16 . 17, 63, 196
20. 18 . . . 56
20. 22 . . . 151
20. 27 . . . 217
20. 28 . . . 90
20. 29 . . . 26
21. 14 . . . 134
21. 16 . . 73, 223
21. 22 . . . 52
21. 28 . . . 143
21. 31 . . . 74
21. 33 . . 198, 199
21. 40 . . . 7
22. 2 . . . 7
22. 5 . . . 149
22. 9 . . . 66
22. 16 . . . 163
22. 17 . . . 74
22. 19 . . . 227
22. 24 . . . 133
23. 8 . . . 80
23. 21 . . . 125
23. 26 . . . 179
23. 27 . . . 117
23. 29 . . . 239
23. 30 . . 74, 176
23. 35 . . . 133
24. 2 . . . 106
24. 5 . . . 224
24. 10 . . . 229
24. 19 . . . 196
24. 22 . . 133, 236
24. 23 . . . 90
24. 24 . . 88, 90
25. 9 . . . 131
25. 10 . . . 236
25. 13 . . 132, 133
25. 16 . . . 169

Acts—*continued*

PAGE

25. 25 . . 239
26. 2 . . . 148
26. 5 . . . 78
26. 7 . . . 70
26. 11 . . . 128
26. 20 . . . 225
26. 22 . . 231, 232
26. 29 . . . 198
27. 1 . . 69, 217
27. 10 . . . 213
27. 12 . . . 194
27. 22 . . . 241
27. 29 . . . 36
27. 34 . . . 106
27. 39 . . 117, 196
28. 6 . . . 239
28. 15 . . . 14
28. 17 . . . 228
28. 17, 19 231, 232

Romans

1. 5 . . . 136
1. 9 . . . 68
1. 10 . . . 194
1. 20 . . 117, 219
1. 24 . . . 217
1. 31 . . . 222
1. 32 . . . 230
3. 13 . . . 52
5. 1 35, 110, 247, 248
5. 2 . . . 145
5. 11 . . . 224
5. 12 . . . 107
5. 20 . . . 207
6. 4 . . . 83
6. 6 . . . 218
6. 11 . . . 103
6. 13 . . 125, 129
7. 3 . . . 217
8. 3 . . . 221
8. 9 . . . 171
8. 12 . . . 217
8. 15 . . . 10
8. 18 . . . 114
8. 20 . . . 105
8. 28 . . . 65
9. 3 . . . 212
9. 5 . . . 228
9. 25 . . . 231
9. 26 . . . 16
10. 3 . . . 163
10. 6 . . . 124
10. 14 . . . 185
11. 4 . . . 59
11. 11 . . . 207
11. 18, 20 . . 125
12. 3 . . 219, 237
12. 5 . . 105, 183

Romans—*continued*

PAGE

12. 6–8 . . . 183
12. 6 . . . 225
12. 9 ff. . . . 182
12. 9–19 . . . 180
12. 14, 15, 16, 19 . 180
12. 15 . . 179, 180
12. 16 f. . . . 182
13. 1 . . . 228
13. 9 . . . 87
13. 11 . . 182, 183
14. 5 . . . 89
14. 20 . . . 125
14. 23 . . . 134
15. 1 . . . 221
15. 4 . . . 115
15. 5, 13 . . . 195
15. 22 . . . 217
15. 23 . . . 217
15. 24 . . . 167
16. 7 . 52, 141, 144
16. 25 . . . 75

1 Corinthians

1. 18 . . . 114
3. 8 . . . 90
3. 19 . . . 65
4. 3 . . 210, 236
4. 8 . . . 200
4. 21 . . . 12
6. 2 . . 103, 236
6. 3 . . . 240
6. 5 . . . 99
6. 7 . . . 162
6. 11 . . . 163
7. 2 . . . 89
7. 5 . . . 169
7. 15 . . . 172
7. 27 . . . 125
7. 31 . . . 64
7. 37 . . . 224
8. 6 . . . 106
8. 13 . . . 191
9. 6 . . . 220
9. 10 . . . 217
9. 19 . . . 230
9. 21 . . . 236
9. 26 . . . 231
10. 2 . . . 163
10. 13 . . . 217
10. 29 . . . 87
11. 23 . . 237, 246
11. 29 . . . 230
11. 34 . . . 167
12. 2 . . 115, 167
13. 12 . . . 113
13. 13 . . 58, 78
14. 5 . 187, 208, 248
14. 8 . . . 156

1 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

PAGE

14. 10 . . . 196
14. 11 . . 103, 104
14. 27 . . . 79
14. 39 . . . 125
15. 2 . . . 171
15. 4 . . 137, 141
15. 6 . . . 136
15. 9 . . 79, 236
15. 22 . . . 114
15. 28 . . 149, 163
15. 29 . . . 58
15. 31, 32 . . 114
15. 32 . . . 120
15. 33 . . . 45
15. 37 . . 151, 196
15. 50 . . . 58
16. 2 . . . 54
16. 3 . . . 58
16. 4 . . 216, 217
16. 5 . . . 120
16. 6 . . . 74
16. 11 . . . 178

2 CORINTHIANS

1. 4 . . . 93
1. 8 . . 217, 220
1. 9 . . . 145
. 17 . . . 210
2. 7 . . . 193
2. 13 . . 145, 220
4. 8 . . . 237
4. 8, 9 . . . 231
5. 3 . . . 115
5. 4 . . . 107
5. 19 . . 212, 227
6. 9 . . . 114
7. 5 . 145, 182, 225
8. 6 . . . 219
8. 7 . . . 179
8. 11 . . . 217
8. 18 . . . 68
8. 23 . . . 105
8. 24 . . . 181
9. 11 . . . 182
9. 11, 13 . . . 181
10. 2 . . . 212
10. 9 . . . 167
10. 14 . . . 68
11. 1 . . . 200
11. 2 . . . 160
11. 5 . . . 239
11. 16 . . . 178
11. 21 . . . 212
11. 25 . 144, 145, 148
12. 2 . . 101, 229
12. 9 . . . 180
12. 17 . . . 144
12. 19 . . . 119
13. 5 . . . 171

GALATIANS

PAGE

1. 5 . . . 183
1. 6 f. . . 80, 246
1. 7 . . . 171
1. 22 f. . . . 227
2. 2 . . 193, 201
2. 10 . . . 179
2. 13 . . . 209
3. 2 . . . 117
3. 17 . . . 219
3. 23 . . . 114
4. 6 . . 10, 233
4. 8 . . . 231
4. 11 . . 193, 248
4. 13 . . . 106
4. 27 . . 127, 231
4. 30 . . . 177
5. 1 . . 61, 125
5. 12 . . 163, 201
5. 14 . . . 87
5. 15 . . . 124
5. 16 . 118, 130, 191
5. 26 . . . 177
6. 5 . . . 90

EPHESIANS

1. 1 . . . 228
1. 6 . . . 93
1. 10 . . . 107
1. 13 . . 67, 68
1. 15 . . . 236
1. 16 . . . 159
1. 17 . . 55, 196
2. 5, 8 . . . 127
2. 11 . . 84, 236
2. 15 . . . 103
3. 4 . . . 117
3. 8 . . . 236
3. 16 . . . 55
3. 17 . . . 182
4. 1 . 84, 93, 236
4. 2, 3 . . . 181
4. 24 . . . 182
4. 26 . . . 125
4. 28 . . . 127
5. 18 . . . 126
5. 22 . . . 181
5. 33 . . . 179
6. 13 . . . 115
6. 22 . . . 135

PHILIPPIANS

1. 5 . . . 236
1. 30 . . . 225
2. 1 . . . 59
2. 12 . . . 174
2. 23 . . . 167

PHILIPPIANS—*continued*

PAGE

2. 26 . . . 227
2. 30 . . . 64
3. 3 . . . 231
3. 4 . . . 230
3. 5 . . 10, 102
3. 7 . . . 148
3. 10 . . . 218
3. 11 f. . . 187, 194
3. 13 . . . 212
3. 16 . . 179, 204
3. 19 . . . 50
3. 21 . . . 217
4. 11 . . . 229
4. 14 . . . 228

COLOSSIANS

1. 4, 8 . . . 236
1. 26 . . . 224
2. 1 . . . 52
2. 2 . . . 182
2. 8 . 178, 192, 228
2. 18 . . . 239
2. 19 . . . 231
2. 21 . . . 124
3. 9 . . . 126
3. 16 . . 181, 182
3. 17 . . 181, 183
3. 18 . . . 163
4. 6 . . . 183
4. 15 . . . 48

1 THESSALONIANS

2. 4 . . . 231
2. 12 . . . 219
2. 16 . . . 219
3. 1 . . . 231
3. 2 . . . 68
3. 5 . . 193, 201
3. 8 . . . 168
3. 11 . . . 179
4. 9 . . . 219
4. 14 . . 149, 162
4. 15 . . . 191
4. 17 . . . 14
5. 3 . . . 191
5. 4 . . . 210

2 THESSALONIANS

1. 8 . . . 9
2. 2 . . . 212
2. 3 . . . 178
2. 17 . . . 179
3. 5 . . . 179
3. 6 . . . 52
3. 13 . . . 124

1 Timothy

PAGE
1. 13 . . . 230
2. 6 . . . 105
4. 14 . . . 125
4. 15 . . . 184
5. 1 . . 124, 125
5. 13 . . . 229
5. 22 . . . 125
5. 23 . . . 125
6. 3 . . . 171

2 Timothy

1. 8 . . 124, 125
1. 11 . . . 234
1. 12 . . . 204
1. 16, 18 . . 195
1. 18 . . 78, 236
2. 19 . . . 113
2. 25 . 55, 193, 194

Titus

1. 11 . . . 171
1. 12 . . 88, 233
2. 2–10 . . 179
2. 13 . . . 84
3. 8 . . . 207

Philemon

20 . . . 195

Hebrews

1. 1 . . . 107
2. 10 . . . 106
2. 15 . . . 215
3. 5 . . . 151
3. 8, 15 . . 124
3. 12 . 74, 178, 193
3. 16 . . . 36
4. 1 . . . 185
4. 3 . . . 230
4. 7 . . . 124
5. 1 . . . 218
5. 7 . . . 102
6. 4 f. . . . 66
6. 6 . . . 230
6. 10 . . 204, 210
7. 1 . . . 224
7. 2 . . . 224
7. 5 . . . 53
7. 8 . . . 114
7. 9 . . . 204
7. 13 . . . 143
7. 24 . . . 212

Hebrews—*continued*

PAGE
7. 27 . . . 90
8. 6 . . . 56
8. 9 . . . 74
8. 10 . . 107, 224
9. 12 . . 51, 132
9. 18 . . . 143
10. 1 . . 58, 225
10. 14 . . . 127
10. 16 . . 107, 224
10. 17 . . . 190
10. 28 . . . 114
10. 35 . . . 124
11. 1 . . . 231
11. 3 . . . 219
11. 4 . . . 224
11. 5 . . . 217
11. 12 . . . 230
11. 15 . . . 204
11. 17 129, 142, 143, 238
11. 21 . . . 114
11. 28 . . . 144
11. 32 . . . 237
11. 33 . . . 116
11. 34 . . . 116
11. 35 . . 224, 231
12. 7 . . . 82
12. 15 . . . 178
12. 25 . . 124, 200
13. 5 . . . 182
13. 6 . . . 150
13. 9 . . . 125
13. 24 . . . 237

James

1. 1 . . . 179
1. 11 . . . 135
1. 13 . . . 74
1. 24 . 135, 139, 144
2. 1 . . . 125
2. 25 . . . 230
3. 4 . . . 230
3. 13 . . . 93
4. 2 f. . . . 160
5. 16 . . . 156
5. 17 . . . 217

1 Peter

1. 2 . . . 82
1. 8 . . 231, 232
1. 10 f. . . . 115
1. 14 . . . 181
1. 18 . . . 84
1. 24 . . . 135
2. 10 . . . 231
2. 11 . . 91, 181
2. 12 . . 181, 182

1 Peter—*continued*

PAGE
2. 15 . . . 53
2. 18 . . . 181
2. 24 . . . 237
3. 1, 7 . . . 181
3. 1, 7, 9, 15, 16 . 182
3. 3 . . . 236
3. 7 . . . 181
3. 8 f. . . . 180
3. 14 . . . 196
3. 17 . . . 196
4. 3 . . . 11
4. 7 . . . 181
4. 8 ff. . . . 181
4. 11 . . . 181
4. 12 . . . 125
4. 17 . . . 217
4. 18 . . . 150
5. 7 . . . 181

2 Peter

1. 1 . . . 84
1. 9 . . . 171
1. 10 . . . 191
1. 12 . . . 230
1. 18 . . . 222
1. 19 . 47, 169, 228
2. 5 . . . 97
2. 14 . . 47, 74
2. 22 . 155, 156, 238
3. 16 . . . 88

1 John

1. 3 . . . 143
1. 9 . . . 210
2. 19 . . 148, 201
2. 24 . . . 69
4. 1 . . . 125
4. 2 . . . 229
4. 3 . . . 171
4. 16 . . . 68
5. 3 . . . 211
5. 10 . . . 171
5. 15 . . 160, 168

2 John

7 . . . 229
8 . . 50, 116
10 . . . 125

3 John

4 . . . 236
5 . . . 116
6 . . . 228

JUDE

PAGE
1 . . . 103
5 . . . 230

REVELATION

1. 4 . . . 9
1. 5 . . . 9, 12
1. 16 . . . 36
1. 20 . . . 9
2. 2 . . . 56
2. 3, 5 . . . 52
2. 4 . . . 52
2. 5, 16 . . 75
2. 7 . . . 85
2. 13 . . . 12
2. 26 . . . 69
2. 27 . . . 145
3. 2 . . . 114
3. 3 . 63, 143, 145
3. 5 . . . 104
3. 8 . . . 237
3. 15 . . . 200

REVELATION—*continued*

PAGE
3. 16 . . . 114
4. 4 . . . 36
4. 9 . . . 168
5. 5 . . . 125
5. 7 . . 143, 145
6. 6 . . . 125
7. 1 . . . 36
7. 2 . . . 237
7. 3 . . . 125
7. 9 . . . 237
7. 14 . . . 145
8. 1 . . . 168
8. 4 . . . 75
8. 5 . . 143, 145
9. 6 . . . 190
9. 11 . 69, 233, 235
9. 12 . . . 58
9. 14 . . . 36
9. 20 . . . 210
10. 2 . . . 225
10. 4 . . . 125
10. 10 . . 111, 115
11. 5 . . . 187
11. 17 . . 52, 145

REVELATION—*continued*

PAGE
11. 18 . . . 118
12. 4 . . . 114
12. 6 . . . 59
12. 7 . 106, 217, 218
12. 9 . . . 233
13. 8, 12 . . 237
14. 4 . . . 168
14. 8 . . . 135
14. 13 . . 114, 248
14. 20 . . . 102
17. 3 . . . 65
18. 2 . . 134, 135
18. 14 . . 190, 192
18. 22 . . . 192
19. 3 . . . 145
19. 10 . . . 178
20. 2 . . . 233
20. 4 . . . 130
20. 8 . . . 237
21. 12, 14 . . 225
21. 13 . . . 73
21. 21 . . . 105
21. 27 . . . 241
22. 9 . . . 178

(*b*) OLD TESTAMENT.

N. B.—The numbering of the chapters is according to the English Bible; where the LXX differs, the numbers are added in brackets. So with titles of Books.

PAGE
Gen. 1. 10 . . 46
,, 3. 10 . . 161
,, 4. 24 . . 98
,, 6. 17 . . 49
,, 8. 13 . . 237
,, 21. 26 . . 241
,, 24. 11 . . 162
,, 43. 16 . . 63
,, 43. 23 . . 240
,, 45. 8 . . 94
Ex. 1. 16 . . 54
,, 3. 14 . . 228
,, 32. 1 . . 142
Num. 11. 29 . 194
Deut. 23. 1 . . 163
,, 28. 24 ff. . 194
Jos. 1. 11 . . 70
,, 17. 13 . . 76
Judg. 9. 29 . . 194
,, 9. 53 . . 112
Ruth 1. 9 . . 194

PAGE
1 Sam. (1 K.) 1. 11 191
,, 9. 9 . . 235
,, 13. 15 . 14
2 Sam. (2 K.) 18. 33 194
,, 20. 20 . 240
,, 21. 24 . 50
1 Chr. 11. 19 . 240
Job 22. 3 . . 168
,, 24. 12 . . 88
,, 30. 20 . . 147
,, 31. 31 . . 198
,, 31. 35 . . 194
Ps. 6. 9 . . 174
,, 32 (31). 3 . 147
,, 120 (119). 3 . 194
,, 141 (140). 1 . 147
Prov. 3. 5 . . 226
,, 9. 12 . 88, 89
,, 22. 7 . . 88
,, 27. 15 . . 88
Eccles. 2. 16 . . 70

PAGE
Ca. 8. 1 . . 194
Isai. 5. 27 . . 189
,, 14. 31 . . 176
,, 28. 16 . . 68
,, 33. 24 . . 185
,, 53. 5 . . 143
Jer. 9. 2 . . 194
,, 31 (38). 33 . 107
Ezek. 26. 13 . . 192
Dan. 10. 13, 20 . 217
Hos. 11. 1 . . 138

APOCRYPHA

Esth. 13. 3 . . 198
,, 14. 3 . . 54
2 Mac. 3. 16 . . 16
,, 9. 24 . . 194
,, 12. 4 . . 167
4 Mac. 5. 13 . . 198

(*c*) INSCRIPTIONS.

Archiv
Archiv für Papyrusforschung, ed. U. Wilcken.
PAGE PAGE PAGE
iii. 129 . . 14

Audollent
Defixionum Tabellae, ed. Audollent (Paris, 1904).
no. 15 . . . 234
no. 92 . . . 195
no. 189 . . . 234

BCH
Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.
1888, p. 202 . . 234
1902, p. 217 . . 196
1903, p. 335 . . 234

Cauer
*Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum, propter dialectum memorabilium*², ed. P. Cauer (Leipzig, 1883).
no. 32 . . . 214
47 . . . 214
122–5 . . 214
148 . . 214
no. 157 . . . 214
171 . . . 214
179 . . . 214
no. 220 . . . 214
264 . . 178, 214
431 . . . 214

Cooke
North Semitic Inscriptions, by G. A. Cooke (Oxford, 1903).
no. 110 . . . 236
no. 113 . . . 236

IMA
Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei, ed. von Gärtringen and Paton.
iii. 174 . . . 167
iii. 325 . . . 100
iii. 1119 . . . 51

JHS
Journal of Hellenic Studies (Hellenic Society).
xix. 92 . . . 86
xix. 299 . . . 93
xxii. 369 . . 7, 220
xxiii. 85 . . . 240
xxv. 63 . . . 239

Letronne (or **Letr.**)
Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Egypte, ed. Letronne (1842).
no. 117 . . 159
149 . . . 60
190 . . . 102
no. 198 . . . 102
221 . . . 240
no. 557 . . . 240
vol. ii. p. 286 . 240

Magn.
Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1900).
no. 47 . . . 52
no. 114 . . . 64
no. 215 . . . 198

Michel
Recueil d'inscriptions grecques, ed. C. Michel (Brussels, 1900).
no. 32 . . . 64
41 . . . 32
54–6 . . 214
60 . . . 214
182 . . . 214
197 . . . 214
no. 357 . . . 214
370 . . . 216
417 . . . 214
436 . . . 214
585 . . . 38
no. 694 . 46, 101, 214
1001 . . 101, 214
1333 . . . 214
1409 . . . 55
1411 . . . 55

OGIS

Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-5).

PAGE
no. 17 . . . 64
41 . . . 216
54 . . . 105
56 . . . 73
no. 87 . . 64
90 102, 167, 216
219 . . 238
383 . . 21
no. 435 . . 101
665 . . 121
710 . . 76
751 . . 150

Ramsay, C. and B.

Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, by W. M. Ramsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1895, 1897).

ii. 380 . . . 239
391 . . . 239
392 . . . 240
394 . . . 239
ii. 472 . . . 240
477 . . . 239
485 . . . 238
497 . . . 48
530 . . . 239
ii. 535–8 . . 240
537 . . . 234
559 f. . . 240
565 . . . 56

Roberts-Gardner

Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, vol. ii., The Inscriptions of Attica; ed. E. S. Roberts and E. A. Gardner (Cambridge, 1905).

p. 179 . . . 212 | p. 258 (no. 97) . 234

Viereck *SG*

Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Populusque Romanus . . . usi sunt, by P. Viereck (Göttingen, 1888).

pp. 12, 13, 21 . 101

(*d*) Papyri.

Archiv (see under (*c*) above)
iii. 60 . . . 17 | iii. 173 . . . 236

BM

British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon (London, 1893, 1898, 1907). (See Addenda.)

Vol. i. nos. 1–138.
no. 18 . . . 52
20 . . . 167
21 . . 196, 208
no. 23 . . . 220
41 . . . 52
no. 42 . . . 240
130 . . . 236

Vol. ii. nos. 139 ff.
no. 177 . . . 236
220 . . . 234
233 . . . 169
no. 239 . . . 93
301 . . . 195
336 . . . 80
no. 401 . . . 239
417 . . . 70
970 . . . 17

BU

Griechische Urkunden, from the Berlin Museum.

Vol. i. nos. 1–361 (1895).
no. 16 . . . 244
18 . . . 220
31 . . . 60
36 . . . 220
46 . . . 220
48 . . . 179
69 . . . 75
98 . . . 230
no. 114 . . . 239
136 . . . 146
151 . . . 229
163 . . . 144
164 . . . 220
183 . . . 227
195 . . . 220
197 . . . 177
no. 225 . . . 234
226 . . . 220
243 . . . 220
297 . . . 248
303 . . . 240
321 . . . 220
326 . 59, 169, 187
361 . . . 231

BU—*continued.*

Vol. ii. nos. 362–696 (1898).

PAGE
no. 362 . . . 14
366 . . . 84
368 . . . 84
371 . . . 84
395 . . . 84
424 . . . 168
449 . . . 86

PAGE
no. 457 . . . 220
531 . . . 208
537 . . . 234
546 . . . 168
577 . . . 60
592 . . . 101
595 . . . 220

PAGE
no. 607 . . 36, 168
623 . . . 96
625 . 177, 208, 220
632 . . . 159
651 . . . 220
665 . . 219, 236

Vol. iii. nos. 697–1012 (1903).

no. 731 . . . 220
741 . . . 196
747 . . . 220
775 . . . 160
814 . . 142, 177
822 . . . 93

no. 830 . . . 219
836 . . . 101
845 . . . 220
887 . . . 75
925 . . . 236
926 . . . 54

no. 948 . . . 11
970 103, 159, 235, 236
997 . . . 60
998 . . . 107
1002 . . . 60

Vol. iv. nos. 1013 ff. (in progress).

no. 1013 . . . 60
1015 . . . 238
1031 . . . 220
1033 . . . 51
1036 . . . 60

no. 1040 . . . 236
1041 . . . 75
1044 . . . 97
1050 . . . 103
1052 . . . 91

no. 1053 . . . 161
1055 . . . 161
1057 . . . 80
1059 . . . 235
1079 . . 107, 178

Ch P

Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1902).

no. 3 . . . 162
no. 4 . . . 230
no. 15 . . . 101

CPR

Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, ed. C. Wessely (Vienna, 1895).

no. 4 . . . 223
19 . . 212, 239
24 . . 127, 169

no. 25 . . . 169
28 . . . 127

no. 156 . . . 220
237 . . . 169

Eudoxus

Papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, ed. Blass 78, 91

PFi

Florence Papyri, ed. Vitelli and Comparetti (Lincei Academy: fasc. i., ii., Milan, 1905–).

no. 2 . . 76, 220

no. 5 . . . 106

no. 24 . . . 53
50 . . . 239

Hl P

Heidelberg Papyri (mainly LXX), ed. G. A. Deissmann (1905).

no. 6 . . . 196

KP

Papyri from Karanis, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1900).

no. 37 . . . 60
no. 46 . . . 72

LP

Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, ed. C. Leemans (1843).

B . . . 195, 220
C 50

E 159
G 45

U . . . 60, 237
W 79, 195, 197, 245

MP

Papyri from Magdola, in *BCH* 1902 ff., ed Lefebvre.

PAGE
no. 16 . . . 105
no. 20 . . . 105
no. 25 . 100, 239

Mithras Liturgy

Eine Mithrasliturgie, by A. Dieterich (Leipzig, 1903).

p. 12 . . . 54
p. 17 . . . 40

NP

Geneva Papyri, ed. J. Nicole, 2 vols. (1896–1906).

no. 1 . . . 229
7 . . . 208
16 . . . 220
17 . . . 193
no. 19 . . . 142
47 . . . 101
49 . . . 228
51 . . . 188
no. 53 . . . 55
67 . . . 80
69 . . . 80

Par P

Paris Papyri, in *Notices et Extraits*, xviii. part 2, ed. Brunet de Presle (1865).

no. 5 . . 228, 246
8 . . . 226
10 . . . 234
13 . . . 231
14 . . . 231
15 . 59, 73, 240
18 . . 12, 168
22 . 60, 62, 110
no. 26 . 60, 167, 168
28 . . . 62
35 . . . 72
36 . . . 107
37 . . . 72
40 . . 231, 244
42 . . . 179
44 . . . 229
no. 46 . . . 167
47 . . . 200
48 . . . 6, 53
49 17, 103, 193, 205
51 . 85, 121, 208
60 . . 46, 84
62 . . 46, 168
63 14, 61, 99, 198, 223

Path P

Papyri from Pathyris, in *Archiv* ii. 514 ff., ed. de Ricci.

no. 1 . . . 223

PP

Flinders Petrie Papyri, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in Proc. Royal Irish Acad., 3 vols., 1891–1905). (See Addenda.)

i. no. 13 . . 168
ii. no. 19 . . 223
ii. no. 37 . . 93

TP

Turin Papyri, ed. Peyron (1826).

no. 1 . 75, 103, 197, 229, 231, 246
no. 3 . . . 231
5 . . . 159
no. 8 . . 231, 237

The following collections are (with one exception) from the publications of the Egypt Exploration Fund; the papyri were discovered and mainly edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt:—

RL

Revenue Laws of Ptolemy and Philadelphus, ed. Grenfell and Mahaffy (Oxford, 1896).

col. 29 . . . 93
col. 38 . . . 103
col. 51 . . . 248

G

An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic, ed. Grenfell (1896).

no. 18 . . . 234
no. 30 . . . 223
no. 35 . . . 223

GH

Greek Papyri, series II. (1897).

PAGE

no. 14 . . . 54
15 . . . 84

no. 26 . . 91, 223
36 . . 106, 159

no. 38 . . . 169
46 . . . 48

OP

Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

Vol. i. nos. 1–207 (1898).

no. 6 . . . 70
34 . . . 169
41 . . . 106
60 . . . 199

no. 67 . . . 204
69 . . . 220
71 . . . 199
82 . . . 220
86 . . . 220

no. 99 . . . 84
105 . . . 169
113 . . . 160
119 . 28, 64, 234, 240
121 . 97, 208

Vol. ii. nos. 208–400 (1899).

no. 237 . 168, 197, 213, 220, 240
240 . . . 195
261 . . . 106

no. 265 . . 45, 64
266 . . . 239
275 . . . 220
285 . . . 226

no. 286 . . . 231
292 . . 54, 79
295 . . 123, 156
299 . . . 85

Vol. iii. nos. 401–653 (1903).

no. 413 . . . 175
471 . . . 231
477 . . 63, 141
478 . . . 146
482 . . . 142

no. 486 . . . 99
488 . . . 104
491 . . . 231
492 . . . 101
496 . . 159, 187
523 . . . 103

no. 526 . 195, 200, 210
527 . . . 60
528 . 99, 142, 234
530 . . 132, 200
531 . . . 234

Vol iv. nos. 654–839 (1904).

no. 654 . . . 130
658 . . . 99
708 . . . 105
715 . . . 195
716 . . . 78

no. 717 . . . 121
724 . . . 103
725 . . . 223
726 . . 106, 231
727 . . 230, 231
736 . . 170, 216

no. 738 . . . 170
742 . . . 76
744 . . 123, 208
745 . . . 91
811 . . . 64

FP

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri (1900).

no. 109 . . . 160
110 . . . 162
112 . 123, 178, 223

no. 118 . . . 101
121 . . . 131
122 . . . 101

no. 124 . . . 73
126 . . . 168
130 . . . 169

AP

Amherst Papyri, part ii. (1901].

no. 30 . . 97, 238
78 . . 223, 231
86 . . . 179

no. 93 . . . 168
99 . . . 246
113 . . . 60

no. 130 . . . 86
135 17, 77, 208, 246 f.
144 . . . 240

Tb P

Tebtunis Papyri (University of California Publications), part i. (1902).

no. 6 . . 123, 169
12 . 103, 223, 234
13 . . . 131
14 . . 99, 223
24 . . . 79
26 . . . 86
27 . 78, 103 *bis*
28 . . . 169
33 . . . 78
34 . . 231, 232

no. 35 . . . 162
38 . . . 46
41 . . 231, 236
42 . . . 223
43 . . . 14
50 . . . 131
58 . 86, 168, 223
59 . . 223, 234
62 . . . 235
63 . . . 97

no. 64 . . . 235
69 . . . 107
72 . . 103, 236
82 . . . 235
98 . . . 235
104 . . 64, 241
105 79, 234, 235, 246
107 . . . 234
124 . . . 235
230 . . . 72

(*e*) GREEK LITERATURE.

i. *Classical.*

Homer (? x/viii B.C.)
PAGE
Iliad i. 1 . . 172
i. 137 . 166, 239
i. 587 . . xvii
PAGE
Iliad vi. 284 . . 134
vi. 459 . . 185
PAGE
Iliad xxii. 349 . 98
xxiv. 38 . . xvii
Odyssey i. 337 . 55

Pindar (v/B.C.)
Pyth. iv. 189 . 132

Aeschylus (v/B.C.)
Prom. Vinct. 268 f. 249
358 . . . 245
Prom. Vinct. 447 f. 76
956 f. . . 134
Persae 981 . . 97

Sophocles (v/B.C.)
Antigone 114 . 74
542 . . 93
789 . . 202
Oedipus Coloneus
155 . . 179
Oedipus Tyrannus
236 . . . 73
533 . . . 74
706 . . . 149
1141 . . . 93
Oedipus Tyrannus
1068 . . . 93
1199 . . . 84
Philoctetes 300 . 178
Eris 201 (Dindorf) 97

Euripides (v/B.C.)
Alcestis 386 . 134
Bacchae 1065 . 115
Hecuba 1163 . 113
Ion 771 . . 184
Iph. Taur. 1092 . 222
1359 . . . 58
Medea 213 f. . . 135
822 . . . 248
1320 . . . 177

Aristophanes (v/B.C.)
Acharn. 484 . 227
Pax 291 . . 161
Ranae 521 . . 70
618–622 . 247
721 . . 227
Thesmophor. 1108 . 188
Aves 1534 . . 247

Hippocrates (v/B.C.)
Epidem. vii. 51 . 101

Herodotus (v/B.C.)
vi. 32 . . 81
vi. 46 . . . 101

Antiphon (v/B.C.)
Frag. M. 3. 67 . 227

Thucydides (v/B.C.)
iv. 54 . . 227

[Xenophon] (v/B.C.)
De Republ. Athen.
II. 3 . . 31

Xenophon (iv/B.C.)
Hellenica I. vi. 4 247
III. ii. 14 . . 212

Plato (iv/B.C.)
Alcibiades 124A 146, 238
Apologia 18B . 202
20E . . 122
21A . . 122
Apologia 28C . 142
36E . . 249
39A . . 192
Crito 52A . . 71
44A . . 141
Gorgias 481A . 194
Euthydemus 276B . 229
Euthyphro 14E . 93
Theaetetus 144B . 144
Protagoras 312A . 192
Republic i. 337B . 177

Aeschines (iv/B.C.)
In Ctes. 71 . 245

Demosthenes (iv/B.C.)
Aristocrates 659 177
Meidias 525 . . 186

[Demosthenes] (?)
PAGE PAGE PAGE
Aristogeiton 797 76

Aristotle (iv/B.C.)
Poetics 19 . . 172

ii. *Hellenistic.*

[For the main writers in this section see also Index III.]

Pseudo-Aristeas (iii/ii B.C. ?) (Wendland's sections)
215 . . . 87

Polybius (ii/B.C.) (Hultsch's pages)
50 (i. 41) . . 85
516 (v. 92) . 207
1004 (xviii. 36) . 247
1270 (xxxii. 10) . 87
1270 (xxxii. 12) . 76

Cicero (i/B.C.)
Ad Att. vi. 5 . 178 f.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis (i/B.C.)
x. 10 . . . 65

Philo Judæus (i/A.D.)
De Posteritate Caini, § 145 . 100
De Opificio Mundi, § 62 . . . 96

Flavius Josephus (i/A.D.) (Niese's sections)
Antiq. i. 29 . 237
ii. 18 . . 26
vii. 202 . . 235
Antiq. xiv. 317 . 101
xx. 169 . . 235
c. Apion. i. 21 . 146
Bell. ii. 262 . . 235

Dionysius Thrax (i/A.D.)
154

Plutarch (i/A.D.)
p. 256D . . 216
p. 608B . . 246
p. 767 . . . 245

[Barnabas] (i/A.D.)
ii. 28 . . . 74
v. 13 . . . 210

Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)
ad Cor. 17 . . 38
ad Cor. 21 . . 95

Ignatius (ii/A.D.)
Eph. cc. 3 and 11 215

Justin Martyr (ii/A.D.)
Apology i. 22, 32, 44, 60, 62, ii. 2 143

Epistle to Diognetus (ii/A.D. ?)
c. 7 . . . 76
c. 9 . . . 246

Aelian (ii/A.D.)
N.A. viii. 12 79, 245

Arrian (ii/A.D.)
Epictetus ii. 2. 16 210
iv. 1. 39 . . 247
iv. 1. 41 . . 248

Lucian (ii/A.D.)
Dialogi Marini, iv. 3 . 76, 87
Dialogi Mortuorum, xxiii. 3 . . xvii.
Piscator 6 . . 144

Marcus Aurelius (ii/A.D.)
vi. 42 . . 76
vii. 13 . . . 87
viii. 50 . . . 185

PAGE PAGE PAGE

Ascensio Isaiae (ii/A.D.)
12 . . . 59

Aquila (ii/A.D.)
Gen. i. 1 . . 13

Clement of Alexandria (ii/A.D.)
Paedagogus iii. 1 193

Doctrina Apostolorum (ii/A.D. ?)
i. 5 . . . 188

[Clement] (iii/A.D. ?)
Homilies iii. 69 . 177
Homilies xv. 8 . 80

John Chrysostom (iv/A.D.)
ix. 259B . . 229
on Ro 5^{20} . . 207

Isocrates (Argument to—vi/A.D.)
Busiris . . 212
Areopagiticus . 212

Pelagia
Legende der hl. Pelagia, ed. Usener . 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 249

Apocrypha
in Preuschen's *Antilegomena* (ed. 1)
Gosp. acc. to Hebrews, no. 4 (p. 4) . . 17
Ebionite Gospel, no. 2b (p. 9) . 17
Gospel of Peter 35 (p. 16) . . 97
in Tischendorf's *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*
Acts of Philip 36 (p. 92) . . 97
Acts of Thomas 41 (p. 224) . . 246

iii. *Modern.*

Abbott
Songs of Modern Greece, by G. F. Abbott (Cambridge, 1900) (See p. 29 n.^{2}.)
p. 22, 26 . 121
42 . 85, 170
44 . 106, 121
56 . . 38
p. 70 . . . 12
128 f. . . 102
184 . . . 91
200 . . . 159
p. 222 . . . 119
224 . . . 162
228 . . . 157

Pallis (see p. 30 n^{1}.)
title . . . 102
Mt 11^{1} . . 17
Mt 22^{11} . . 232
Lk 6^{42} . . . 232
Lk 20^{16}. . . 240
Jn 10^{12}. . . 232

(*f*) LATIN

Cicero
Pro Archia 23 . 242

Vergil
Eclogues vii. 16 . 218
Aeneid vii. 125 . 18

Livy
ix. 1 . . . 58

Juvenal
iii. 60 f. . . 5

II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS.

α : for αυ 47—ᾱ to η in Κοινή—pure in Attic 33, 38, 244—ᾱ in MGr dialects 32, 243—ᾰ in Vocative 48 n.
Ἀββά 10, 233
ἀγαπητός 221
ἀγγαρεύω written ἐγγ- 46
ἄγειν : 1st aor. 56, 76—action in future 149—ἄγωμεν 175, 177—ἄγε 171, 238—ἀγήοχα, etc. 154
Ἀγοῦστος 47
ἀγωνίζεσθαι : perfective compound 116—pres. imper. 174
ἀδικεῖν voices 162
ἀδύνατος 221
ἀεί 233
αι, ε : identity of sound 34, 51, 56, 199—caused *vv.ll.* 35
αἱρεῖν voices 158 f.
αἴρειν pres. and perf. ptc. 222
αἰσχύνεσθαι c. infin. 205
αἰτεῖν : voices 160—with ἵνα 207—and ἐρωτᾶν 66
αἰφνίδιος or ἐφνιδ. 35
ἀκατάπαστος 47, 74
ἀκήκοα 154
ἀκούειν : c. ἀκοῇ 14, 75—c. accus. and gen. 66, 235, 245—future forms 154—perfect 154
ἀλεεῖς spelling 45
ἀλείφειν voice 236
ἀλλά and εἰ μή 241
ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτούς 87, 157 n.
ἄλλος and ἕτερος 79 f., 246
ἅμα 99
ἁμαρτάνειν future 155
ἀμείνων 78
ἀμφί disappearance of 100
ἀμφότεροι : supplants ἄμφω 57—of more than two 80
-αν accus. ending 49
-αν : in 2nd aor. 51—in perfect 37, 52—in imperfect 52
-ᾶν (not ᾷν) in infin. 53
ἄν : history 165 f., 239—statistics for LXX and NT 166 f.—replaced by ἐάν 42, 166, 186, 234
ἄν : iterative 167 f.—meaning "under the circumstances" or "in that case" 166, 201—in *protases* = ἐάν 43, 167—dropped in compounds 168, 249—in compounds meaning *-soever* 166, 168—with indic. 168—with ὅς 43, 240—with subjunctive 166, 168, 186—ὡς ἄν 167, 169—εἰ μήτι ἄν 169, 239—distinction of pres. and aor. subj. 186
ἄν : in *apodoses* 166—tends to drop out 167, 198, 200 f.—esp. with ἔδει *et sim.* 200—with indic. 106—with opt. 166, 198—in LXX 197—Potential Opt. with ἄν not found thus in NT 179, 197
ἄν : in *questions* with optative 198 f.
ἀνά : frequency 98, 100—distributive 100, 105—ἀνὰ μέσον 99, 100—ἀνὰ μέρος 100
ἀναβαίνειν with infin. 205
ἀναγκάζειν in imperf. 129, 247
ἀνάθεμα 46
ἀνασῖ for -σείει 45
ἀναστάς pleonastic 14, 230
ἀναστρέφεσθαι in ethical sense, no Hebraism 11
ἀνέῳγα 154
ἀνθ' ὧν 100
ἀνοίγειν : ἠνοίγην 2 aor. 56—intransitive perfect of 154
ἄνομος c. gen. 236
ἀντί : meaning 100—frequency 98, 100—with anarthrous infin. 81, 216—compared with ὑπέρ 105
Ἀντίπας flexion of 12
ἄξιος : with anarthrous infin. 203—with τοῦ c. infin. 216
ἀξιοῦν : with infin. 205, 208—with ὅπως in papyri 208
ἆξαι 1st aor. of ἄγω 56, 76
ἀπάγχεσθαι reflexive 155
ἀπαντᾶν : c. dat. 64—future 154
ἀπάντησις 14, 242
ἀπεκατεστάθην double augm. 51
ἀπελπίζειν c. acc. 65
ἀπέρχεσθαι : meaning "arrive" 247—ἀπελθών pleon. 231

ἀπέχειν action 247
ἀπό: frequency 98—outnumbers *ἐκ* 102—partitive 72, 102, 245—with adverbs 99—relations with *ἐκ, παρά, ὑπό* 237—agent after pass. 102, 246—enlargement of use 102, 237, 246—with *καθαρός* 102—with *φοβεῖσθαι* 102—forces in composition 112, 247—c. nom. (*ὁ ὤν*) 9, (12)
ἀπογράφεσθαι voice 162
ἀποδημεῖν pres. and aor. 130
ἀποθνήσκειν: perfective 112, 114, 120—*ὑπό τινος* 156—future 155—for future 114, 120—action in pres. and aor. 112, 114—*τέθνηκα* 114, 147
ἀποκαλύπτειν 136, 139 f.
ἀποκόπτεσθαι voice and meaning 163
ἀποκρίνεσθαι: aorist 39, 161—*ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε* 14, 131
ἀποκρύπτειν: force of aorist 136, 139
ἀποκτείνειν 114, 156
ἀπόλλυσθαι: perfective in present 114—intrans. perf. act. 154—*οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι* 114 (*bis*), 127
ἀπολούεσθαι voice 163
ἀποστερεῖσθαι voice 162
ἀποχωρεῖν ingressive force in present 174
ἀπωθεῖσθαι voice 157
-αρ- = vocalic r 119 n.
ἀριθμῷ = "carefully counted" 76
ἄριστος 78 f.
ἀρκετόν c. *ἵνα* 210
ἁρμόζεσθαι voice 160
ἁρπάζειν: flexion 56—future 155—perfective in *συν-* 113
ἀρραβών spelling 45
ἄρχεσθαι: pleonastic use of *ἤρξατο* 14 f.—present stem an old aorist? 119—c. inf. 205—c. partic. 228—*ἀρξάμενος* 240—no perfective compounds 117
-αρχος and *-ης* 48
-ᾶς nouns in, with gen. *-ᾶδος* or *ᾶ* 38
-ᾶσαι in 2 s. pres. mid. 53 f.
-ασι 3 pl. perf. yielding to *-αν* 52 f.—*ἥκασι* 53
ἀσπάζεσθαι: aoristic use of pres. 119—action of *ἀσπασάμενος* 132, 238
ἀστέρες as accus. 36
ἀσύνετος 222
ἀσύνθετος 222
ἀσφαλῆν accus. 49
ἀτός for *αὐτός* 47
αυ: pronounced *av* in late Greek 234—changed to *ᾱ* 47
αὐτός: emphatic in nom. 85 f.—replacing *ἐκεῖνος* 86—with article, weakening of, 91—*αὐτὸς ὁ, ὁ αὐτός* 91—*αὐτοῦ* gen. of place 73
αὐτούς 87
α(ὐ)χμηρός 47
ἀφειρημένος 35
ἄφιδε et sim. 44
ἀφιέναι: aoristic or iterative present 119—*ἀφέωνται* history of form 38—relation to *ἀφίενται* 119—*ἀφείς* pleonastic 14—*ἄφες* independent and auxiliary 175 f.—c. *ἵνα* 175 f.—c. inf. 176—c. imper. 1st pers. 175—*ἀφίεται, ἀφίησι* 152—*ἀφῆκα* 119, 137 n., 140, 145
ἀφικνεῖσθαι function of perfective *ἀπό* in 247
ἄφιξις later meaning of 26
Ἀχαιοί prehistoric form of 184
ἄχρι 169
-άω verbs: relations with *-έω* 33, 37 (*bis*), 53—subj. of 54—2 s. mid. *-ᾶσαι* 53

β pronunciation 33
Βάαλ gender of 59
-βαίνειν: aorist 110—future mid. 155
βάλλειν: action in pres. and aor. 109, 130—*ἐβλήθη* timeless aor. 134—*βλητέον* 222
βαπτίζεσθαι: voice 163—*ὁ βαπτίζων* 127
βασιλεύειν action in pres. and aor. 109, 130
βαστάζειν flexion 56
βελτίων 78, 236
βιάζεσθαι voice 163
βλέπειν: *β. ἀπό* 107—*β. μή* 124, 178, 193—*βλέποντες βλέψετε* 14, 76
βλητέον 222
βούλεσθαι c. inf. 205
βοῦς 48

γ pronunciation 33
γαμεῖν voices 159
γέγονα: aoristic 145, 238, 239—= *εἰμί*? 146—*γέγοναν* 52 n.
γέγραφα 154
γελᾶν future mid. 154
γένημα spelling 45
γεννᾶσθαι 120
γεύεσθαι c. gen. and acc. 66, 245
γίνεσθαι: orthography 47—*γίνεται* futural 120 (*bis*)—original action of pres. and aor. 109 f.—its imper. 180—development of constr. with *ἐγένετο* 14, 16 f.—*ἐγένετο* with indic. 16 f.—with *καί* and indic. 16 f., 70—*ἐγένετο ὅτε* 16—*ἐγένετο ἦλθε* 12, 16—*ἐγένετο* c. inf. 16 f.—*ἐγενήθη* 139 f.—*μὴ γένοιτο* 194, 240, 249—*γενάμενος* 51—*γέγονα* 52—intrans. perf. act. 154—aoristic 145, 238, 239—= *εἶναι*? 146
γινώσκειν: orthography 47—action of pres. and aor. 113—of perfect 148—future mid. 155—forms *γνοῖ* aor. subj. 55, 196—*γνώῃ* 193—relation to *ἐπιγινώσκειν* 113

γράφειν : form of root 110—perfect 154—c. ἵνα in Polybius and NT 207 f.
γυνή survival of vocative 71

δ pronunciation of 33
δέ with article as demonstrative 81
δεῖσθαι in petitions 173
δέον ἐστί 226
δεῦρο, δεῦτε 172
δεύτερος 96
δηλοῦν c. ἵνα in papyri 208
διά : frequency 98, 104 f.—with acc. and gen. 105 f.—with accus. only in MGr 106—with gen. contrasted with ἐκ, ὑπό 106—perfective action in composition 112 f., 115 f., 118
διαγράφειν aor. and perf. 247 f.
διαλύειν voices confused 159
διαμερίζεσθαι voice 157
διαπορεύεσθαι 113
διαπραγματεύσασθαι 118
διαρρηγνύναι voices 157
διασαφεῖν c. ἵνα in Polybius 207
διατηρεῖν 116
διαφέρειν c. gen. 65
διαφυγεῖν 112, 116
διαφυλάξαι 116
διδόναι : not used in middle 153—forms after -ω and -όω verbs 55—δοῖς, δοῖ aor. subj. 55, 196—δωη 55, 193 f., 196, 198—in LXX 194 n.—δῷ 55—δώσῃ 151—action in pres. and aor. 129—δόμεναι and δόμεν 207
διέρχεσθαι pres. used for future 120
διώκειν : compared with perfective 112, 116—action of aor. 116—future in act. form 154
δοκεῖν 15
δόξα -ης 48
δράσσεσθαι c. acc. 65
δύνασθαι : flexion 55—δύνῃ 54—c. inf. 205
δυνατός c. infin. 203 f.
δύνειν no perfective 117
δύο : flexion 57—δέκα δύο 96, 246——ordinal 96—(ἀνὰ) δύο δύο 21, 97
δυσβάστακτος 56
δώδεκα 96, 246

ε thematic vowel 171
ε- augment 128, 129
ε and αι : sounded alike 34, 51, 56, 199—caused *vv.ll.* 35
ἐάν for ἄν after ὅς, etc. 42 f., 49 n., 166, 186, 234—history of 234—c. indic. 168, 187 (*bis*)—with futuristic subj. 185—with dependent clauses 185—with μή as negative 185, 187—relations with εἰ 187—replaced by εἰ . . . ἄν in illiterate Greek 169, 239—replaced by participial clause 229 f.
ἐᾶν c. inf. 205
ἑαυτόν : reciprocal in plural 87—replaced by ψυχή 87, 105 n.—ἑαυτοῦ and ἴδιος 87, 89—ἑαυτῷ (-οῖς) c. act. compared with middle 157—ἑαυτούς and ἀλλήλους 87, 157 n.
ἔβην 110
ἐγγαρεύω 46
ἐγγύς c. gen. and dat. 99
ἐγείρειν : with εἰς 71 f.—perfect and aor. 137, 141—ἐγερθεὶς pleonastic 14—ἐγήγερται 137, 141—voices 163
ἔγνωκα 148—ἔγνων 113
ἐγώ : emphasis in nom. 85—replaced by ἡμεῖς 86 f., 246
ἐδέετο 54
ἔδει : with dropped ἄν 200—c. ἵνα 210—app. replaced by ἦν 16
-έδετο 55
ἐδόθης history of suff. 161
ἐδολιοῦσαν 52
-έδοτο 55, 161
ἔθηκα 145
ει, ι, η, ῃ, οι : approximating sounds 34, 41, 46 f., 51, 199 n.—caused *vv.ll.* 35
εἰ : relations with ἐάν 187—with *indic.* 187—replaced by participial clause 230—with imperf. indic. 201—with future 187—with pres. indic. to express future conditions 187—with past indic. 187—with *subj.* 187—εἰ . . . ἄν in illiterate Greek 239—with *optative* 196—expressing a wish 196—in questions 194—"to see if" 194—εἰ οὐ with indic. 171, 187, 200, 240— εἰ μή 171, 241—εἰ μήτι ἄν 169, 239
εἶδον : aor. 109, 111, 138 f., 141—edited ἴδον 47
εἰδυίης 38
εἰκάς 96
εἰκόνες, 70, 235
εἴληφα aoristic ? 145, 154, 238
εἶμι Attic use as future 120
-ειν in pluperfect 53
εἶ μήν 46
εἶναι : flexion 55 f.—middle forms 33, 36 f., 55 f.—imperf. : ἦν (1st s.) 56, ἤμην 56, 201—ἦν for ᾖ 49, 168, 187—ἦσθα and ἦσαν as subjunctive—no aorist 110, 174, 201—future 16, 180—inf. c. μέλλειν 151, 204—imper. forms : ἴσθι 174, 180, 226—ἔστω (ἤτω) ἔστωσαν 180—ἐστέ not used 180—infin. a dative 202.—Action 110—εἶναι εἰς 71—use of ὁ ὤν 228, cp. 9 n.—imperf. and imper. in paraphrases with participle 14 f., 225-227, 249—as copula understood 183 f., 225—with adjectives 180, 182—perhaps used for ἔδει 16

εἰπεῖν : has no present 111, 140—εἶπας 51—σὺ εἶπας 86—εἶπεν and ἔλεγεν 128

εἴρηκα aoristic 145

εἰς : frequency 62, 98—meaning 66, 72—εἰς τὸ ὄνομα 100—with ἀπάντησιν 14, 242—forming predicate with εἶναι, etc. 71 f., 76—in place of gen. and dat. 246—encroaches on ἐν 62 f., 66, 234 f., 245—replaced by ἐν 245—relation with ἐπί 68—with infin. anarthrous 81, 216—εἰς τό c. infin. 218–220

εἷς : as ordinal 95 f., 237—as indef. art. 96 f.—ὁ εἷς 97—εἷς and τις 97—distributive use 105—εἷς τὸν ἕνα reciprocal 246

εἶτεν 46

εἶχαν 52

εἴωθα 154

ἐκ : frequency 98—survival into MGr 102, 246—partitive 72, 102—of material 246—joined with adverbs 99—σωθεὶς ἐκ and θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ 102—perfectivising 237—relations with ἀπό 102, 237—with διά (gen.) 106—with παρά and ὑπό 102, 237

ἐκαθερίσθη, 56.

ἑκατόνταρχος and -ης 48

ἐκδικεῖν action in pres. 180

ἐκεῖνος sometimes replaced by αὐτός 91

ἐκλέγεσθαι voice 157

ἐκοιμήθην 162

ἐκρύβη 156, 161

ἐκτὸς εἰ μή 187, 239

ἔλαβον 139 (*bis*), 145, 247

ἐλαιών or ἐλαιῶν 49, 69, 235

ἐλάσσων 79

ἐλάχιστος 79, 236—ἐλαχιστότερος 236

ἔλεος flexion 60

ἐλευθεροῦν action 149

ἐλήλυθα 154

ἐλθών pleonastic 14–16

ἐλπίς 44

ἐμός aud μου 40 f., 211

ἐμπαίζειν fut. 155

ἐμπτύειν fut. 154

ἐν : statistics 62, 98—instrumental 12, 61, 104—of time 16—added to dative 75, 104—in anarthrous prepositional phrases 82, 236—miscellaneous uses 103 f., 107, 245—= παρά (c. dat.) 103—late Greek use of xvii, 103—ἐν Χριστῷ 68, 103—ἐν ἐμοί 103—ἐν τοῖς in the house of 103—ἐν τῷ c. infin. 14, 215, 249—relations with εἰς 62 f., 66 f., 76, 234 f., 245

ἔνδημος 105

ἐνεγκεῖν action 110. See φέρειν

ἐνεδρεύειν c. accus. 64

ἐνεργεῖν : c. accus. 65—voices 156

ἐνήνοχα 154

ἔνοχος c. gen. 39

ἐντρέπεσθαι c. accus. 65

ἐνώπιον 99

ἐξαίφνης, ἐξέφνης 35

ἐξιστάναι action of aorist 134

ἐξόν : accus. abs. 74—ἐξὸν ἦν 227—οὐκ ἐξόν 231 n.

ἐξουθενεῖν and ἐξουδενοῦν 56

ἔξω. See ἔχειν

ἔοικα 154

ἐπάνω 99

ἐπεὶ μή 240

ἐπέρχεσθαι c. dat. 65

ἕπεσθαι : deponent 153—late use c. gen. 245

ἐπί : with three cases 63, 107—frequency 63 n., 98, 107—with adverbs 99—ἐφ' ἅπαξ 99—ἐφ' ᾧ 107—ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό 107—perfectivising 113—with articular inf. in inscriptions 214—relation with εἰς 68

ἐπιβαλών 131

ἐπιγινώσκειν 113

ἐπιθυμεῖν : aorist 139—c. acc. and gen. 65—c. inf. 205.

ἐπιτρέπειν c. inf. 205.

ἐπιφάνεια 102 n.

ἐπιχειρεῖν c. inf. 205

ἐποίησεν and ἐποίει, in sculptors' signatures, 109, 128

ἔπος 111

ἑπτά : for ἑπτάκις 98, 107—arising from a gloss on Σκευᾶς ? 246

ἐραυνᾶν orthography 46

ἐργάζεσθαι : perfective 113—pres. and aor. 116

ἐρρέθην 111

ἔρρωσο (-σθε) 176

ἔρχεσθαι : voice forms 154—ἦλθον 154 n.—ἐλήλυθα 154—possible relation to ἄρχεσθαι 119—followed by *dat. incommodi* 75, 245

ἐρωτᾶν : meaning 66—c. inf. or ἵνα 208

-ες accus. pl. in 33, 36, 37

-ες in perf. and 1st aor. 52

-εσαι in 2 s. mid. 54

ἔσεσθαι : c. μέλλειν 114 n., 151, 205 n.—c. perf. part. 226

ἐσθής flexion 244

ἐσθίειν : flexion 54—why defective 111—its perfective 111, 116—future (φάγομαι) 155, 184

ἐστάθην 162 (*bis*)

ἔσται 56

ἑστάναι 154—ἕστᾰκα 55—ἕστηκα 147 154, 238

ἔστω, ἔστωσαν 56, 180

ἑστώς pleonastic 14

ἔσχηκα. See ἔχειν

ἔσχον a 'point' word 110, 145, 247 f. See ἔχειν

ἕτερος 77—and ἄλλος 79 f., 246

ἔτι in a pres. imper. prohibition 125
ἔτος 44
εὖ ποιεῖν 228 f.—εὖ ποιήσεις "please" 131—εὖ πράσσειν 228 f.
εὐδοκεῖν: c. accus. 64—εὐδόκησα 134
εὐλόγητος predicate without εἶναι 180
εὐοδῶται 54
εὑράμενος 51
ἔφαγον 184 n. See ἐσθίειν
ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι 44
ἔφην 110, 128
ἐφιορκεῖν 234
ἐφνίδιος 35
ἔφυγον, ἔφευγον 116, 119
ἐφυλαξάμην 159
ἐφ᾽ ᾧ 107
ἐχάρην 161
ἔχειν: action in pres. 110, 183—question between ἔχομεν and ἔχωμεν 35, 110, 247, 249—εἶχαν 3 pl. imperf. 52—action in aorist 110, 247 f.—ἔσχον ingressive in NT 145—ἔσχον ἀπό (παρά) σου 110, 246—ἔσχηκα aoristic or genuine perfect 145, 238, 248—future 150—c. infin. 205—ἔχων ἐστί 226—relation with ἀπέχειν 247
ἐχρῆν without ἄν 200
-έω and -άω verbs confused 33, 37 (*bis*), 53
ἔωκα 38 n.
ἑώρακα relations with aorist 141, 143 f.
ἕως: prep. 99—ἕως ὅτου 91—ἕως πότε 107—conjunction c. subj. with ἄν dropped 168 f.

F: in Theban Fίττω 23—κόρFη 244—effect surviving in Attic 38, 244—nothing to do with phenomena of irregular aspiration 44—dropped between vowels 47—in Fέπος and Fρῆμα 111—in prehistoric form of Ἀχαιοί 184

-ζειν verbs in, 33, 56
ζεστός 222
ζηλοῦτε subj. 54
ζῆν: flexion 54—infin. used as indeclinable noun 215, 249.
Ζμύρνα 45

η from ᾱ 33, 38, 244
η, ῃ, ει, ι, οι: approximating pronunciation 34, 41, 199 n., 240—caused *vv.ll.* 35
ἤ: after positive adjective 236—after comparatives 101 n.
ἠγέρθην: tense 137—voice 163
ἥγημαι perf. with pres. force 148
ᾔδειν 55, 201
ἥδιστα elative 236
ἥκαμεν, ἥκασι 53
ἦλθον 138, 140, 154 n.
ἡλίκος 93
ἤλπικα perf. with pres. force? 147
ἡμεῖς for ἐγώ 86, 246
ἡμέρα Hebraistic locution 81
ἤμην, ἤμεθα 56, 201
ἦ μήν 46
ἥμισυ indeclinable 50
ἦν for ἤμην 56
ᾖ(ν), ἦσθα, ἦσαν quasi-subjunctive 49 n., 168, 187
-ην ending "strong" aor. pass. 161
ἠνοίγην 56
ἠξιοῦσαν 52
ἤρξατο use of 14, 15
ἡρπάγην, ἡρπάσθην 56
ἦσθα, ἦσαν quasi-subj. 168, 187
ἤτω 56, 180
ἦχος 60
-ήω verbs almost disappeared from Κοινή 54

-θ- and -τ- interchanged 38
-θαι and -θε pronounced alike 35
θαυμάσαι as ex. of voiceless inf. 203
θεᾶσθαι 117
θεωρεῖν 117
θέλειν: c. ἵνα 179, 208, 248—c. subj. without ἵνα 185—c. inf. 248
θεοδίδακτος 222
θεός and θεά, 60, 244
-θην aorist forms in 161
θνῄσκειν: action in pres. and aor. 114—perfective 112—simplex obsolete except in perf. τέθνηκα 114 (*bis*)—θνητός 222
θυγάτηρ and θύγατερ as voc. 71

ι sounds, two successive coalesce 45
ι, η, ῃ, ει, οι approximating sounds 34, 46 f., 199, 240
-ι- reduplicative, verbs with 109
-ι irrational final 49
ἰᾶσθαι aoristic present 119
ἰδεῖν 116, 117—has no pres. 111—aor. (see εἶδον) punctiliar or constative 116 f., 138
ἴδιος: relation to ἑαυτοῦ 87–90, 237, 246—ὁ ἴδιος 90 f.—καθ᾽ ἰδίαν 44
ἴδον orthography 47
ἰδού: statistics 11 n.—"Hebraic" use of 11—καὶ ἰδού 17, 233—οὐχ ἰδού 244
Ἱεροσόλυμα fem. and neut. 48, 244
Ἰησοῦς flexion 49
ἱκανός in Latinisms 20
ἵλεως 240
ἵνα: enlarged sphere in Western Hellenistic 41, 205, 211—in Polybius 206 f.—in papyri 206, 208—in John 206, 211, 249—c. *indic.* fut. 35—c. *subjunctive*: ecbatic use 206–209, 249—replaces ὅπως 206—consecutive 210, 249—as subject-clause 210 (*bis*)

—with nouns and adject. 210—after verbs of commanding 178, 207 f., 217, 240—c. παρακαλεῖν 205—after ποιεῖν, 208—θέλειν 179, 185, 208, 248—ἄφες 175—as a form of imper. 176, 178 f., 210, 248—with delib. subj. 185—c. *optative* 196 f.—relations with infinitive 205 f., 240 f., 248—with articular infin. 220—τοῦ inf. 217—εἰς τό inf. 218 f.
-ις, -ιν for -ιος, -ιον 48 f., 244
ἴσθι: frequency 180—with adject. or partic. 226
-ίσκω inceptive force of 120
ἱστάναι: orig. iterative 109—new presents ἱστάνειν and στάνειν 55—voice forms 154, 162—ἕστᾰκα 55—ἕστηκα 147, 238—ἕστηκα and στήκειν 238
ἴστε indic. or imper. 245
ἴστω 23

κ, χ, interchanged 38
-κα: aoristic perfects in, 145, 238, 248—relation to strong perfect 154—added to passive aor. in MGr 142
καθαρεύουσα. See Index III
καθαρὸς ἀπό 102
καθ' εἷς 105
καθ' ἔτος 44
καθέζεσθαι action 118
καθῆσθαι: apparently pleonastic 241—no active 153
καθ' ἰδίαν 44
καθίζειν: action 118—καθίσαι 118—καθίσας pleonastic 14
καθορᾶν 117
καθότι with iterative ἄν 167
καί: pronunciation in MGr 243—in place of hypotaxis 12—καὶ ἐγένετο 14, 16—καί γε with participle 230—replaced by κἄν 167
καίπερ with participle 230
καίτοι with participle 230
καλὸν ἦν with ἄν dropped 200
καλῶς ποιεῖν: c. partic. 131—κ. ποιήσεις 173, 228
κἄν 167, 169
κατά: c. gen. and accus. 104—frequency 98, 104 f.—perfectivising compounds 111 f., 115, 117—in compounds dropped in repetition 115—in combination with adverbs 99—distributive 105—καθ' εἷς 105—καθ' ἔτος 44—καθ' ἰδίαν 44
καταβαίνειν 113
καταβαρεῖν c. accus. 65
καταγωνίσασθαι perfective 116
καταδιώκειν perfective aor. 112, 116
καταλαλεῖν c. gen. or in pass. 65
καταλαμβάνειν act. and mid. 158
καταλιπών pleonastic 14
καταλύων pres. partic. conative 127
καταμαθεῖν 117
κατανοεῖν -νοῆσαι 117 (*bis*)
καταντᾶν effective aor. 132
καταπονεῖν passive 65
κατάρατος: predicate without εἶναι 180—relation with κατηραμένος 221
καταφαγεῖν: perfective 111, 116—continued by φαγεῖν 111 n., 115
καταφεύγειν perfective in pres. and aor. 114, 116
καταχεῖν: aor. κατέχεεν 55
καταχρᾶσθαι c. gen. 245
κατέναντι 99
κατεργάζεσθαι 113, 116
κατεσθίειν: perfective 111—action of pres. stem 128—compound continued by simplex 111 n., 115
κατηγορεῖν c. accus. in D 235
κατηραμένος compared with κατάρατος 221
κατισχύειν c. gen. 65
κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν 81
καυθήσωμαι 151
καυχᾶσαι 53
κέκτημαι 147—κεκτῶμαι 54 n.
κελεύειν c. infin. 205
κέν, κέ in Homer 165 f.
κεφαλή 85
κιθών Ionic for χιτών 38
κινδυνεύειν without perfective in NT 117
κλαίειν ingressive aorist 131
κλείς flexion 49
κλέπτειν: future 155—ὁ κλέπτων and ὁ κλέπτης 127
κληρονομεῖν c. accus. 65
κοιμᾶν: survival of true passive? 162—force of aorist 136, 162
Κοινή. See Index III
κομίζειν future 155
κομψῶς and comparative 248
κόρη history of the Attic form 38, 244
κράβατος spelling 244
κράζειν: action of pres. and perf. stems 147—voice forms 154—perf. imper. in LXX 176
κρατεῖν c. accus. and gen. 65, 235
κράτιστος as a title 78
κρείττων (κρείσσων) 78
κρίμα 46
κρύπτειν: voices 156, 161

λαμβάνειν: flexion 56—future 155—εἴληφα aoristic 145, 238—action of ἔλαβον 247—pleonastic λαβών 230—voice forms 154
λαλεῖν: "Hebraic" locution ἐλάλησεν λαλῶν 14
λανθάνειν c. participle 228
λέγειν: action of pres. stem compared with aor. εἰπεῖν and ῥηθῆναι, with cognate nouns 111—λέγει Ἰησοῦς 121—relation of ἔλεγεν and εἶπεν 128—

εἰποῦσα and εἴπασα in one verse 131—εἴρηκα possibly aoristic in Rev 145—λέγειν ἵνα in papyri 208
λιμός gender 60
λογίζεσθαι no perfective in NT 117
λόγός compared with durative stem in λέγειν 111
λοιποῦ gen. of time 73
λούειν voices 155 f., 238 f.
λύειν : injunctive forms 165—λῦσαι 202, 204
Λύστρα flexion 48

-μ in λήμψομαι 56
-μα nouns 46
μακάριος predicate without εἶναι 180
μανθάνειν : action in pres. and aor. 117—its perfective 117—c. ptc. or inf. 229—c. ὅτι clause 229
μάχαιρα flexion 48
μάχεσθαι reciprocal middle 157
μέγιστος nearly obsolete 78
μείζων : flexion 49, 50—as superlative 78—μειζότερος 236
μέλλειν : no perfective in NT 117—c. pres. and aor. infin. 114—c. fut. infin. 114, 157, 205 n.
μέν with article as demonstrative 81
μετά : c. gen. and accus. only 104–106—frequency 98, 105—a Semitism in ποιεῖν and μεγαλύνειν ἔλεος μετά ? xvii, 106, 246 f.—in πολεμεῖν μετά ? 106, 247—relations with σύν 106—μετὰ χαρᾶς 249
μετρεῖν : perfect 248
μέχρι and μέχρι οὗ as conjunction with ἄν dropped 169
μή : history of 169–171, 239—difference from οὐ 169 f.—οὐ μή see οὐ—often = "perhaps" 188, 192 f.—in questions 170, 185, 192 f., 194, 239—in warnings 178, 184, 248—expresses prohibition 169, 192 f., 247—in relative sentences 171, 239
μή : with *indic.* 170 f.—pres. and perf. 192 f.—future 177 f., 185, 188, 193, 240, 248—after εἰ in protases 171, 241—after ὅπως with fut. [not in NT] 185—after βλέπετε 193—after causal ὅτι 171, 239—μήποτε 193—in questions 170—μήτι in questions 170—with *indic. irrealis* 200—ἐπεὶ μή in papyri 240—in cautious assertions 192 f.
μή : with *imperative*, pres. 2 p. in prohibitions 122–126, 247—after ὅρα 124—aorist 3 p. (not with 2 p.) 173, 174
μή : with *subjunctive*, pres. 1st p. pl. 177—after ἐκτὸς εἰ 187, 239—aorist 2 p. in prohibitions 122–126, 173, 178, 185, 188 (*bis*)—3 p. 178, 184, 188—with volitive or deliberative subj. 184—in questions with deliberative subj. 185—in cautious assertions (aor.) 188—after ἐάν 185, 187, 241—after ἵνα 178—after ὅρα, βλέπε, etc. 124, 178—in commands after ἵνα in papyri 178 f.—εἰ μήτι ἄν 169, 239
μή : with *optative* 179, 193 f., 196—μήποτε 199—μὴ γένοιτο 194 f., 240, 249
μή : with *infin.* 170, 239—after verbs *cog. et dic.* 239
μή : with *partic.* 25, 170, 184, 229, 232 f., 239—imperatively 180—in orat. obl. 239
μὴ ὅτι, μὴ ὅτι γε in papyri 240
μήποτε : c. indic. 193—c. opt. 199—c. subj. 194
μήπως c. indic. 248
μήτι c. indic. in questions 170—μήτιγε 240
-μι verbs in, invaded by -ω forms 33, 38, 55 f.
μίσγειν, μιγνύναι, no perfective in NT 117
Μύρα flexion 48

-ν : movable 45—irrational final 49—added to 3rd decl. accus. sing. 49
ναῦς obsolete in vernacular 25 f.
νίπτεσθαι force of middle 155, 156
νοεῖν and κατανοεῖν 117
νοῦς flexion 48
νυκτός gen. of time 73
Νύμφαν accus. of Νύμφᾰ, not Νυμφᾶς 48

ξενίζεσθαι c. dative 64

ο, ω : pronounced alike 35 (*quater*)—confusion of ο, ω 35 n., 244, 248
ὁ καί with alternative name 83
ὀδυνᾶσαι 53
οι, η, ι, υ, ει approximating sounds 34, 199 n., 240
οἶδα : flexion 55—relation to εἶδον 109—absence of aorist 201—a "present perfect" 147 f.—strong perfect 154—ἴστε indic. or imper. ? 245—c. partic. or infin. 229—c. ὅτι-clause 229
οἰκεῖος in Josephus 88 f.
οἰκοδομημένη 51
οἶκος : ἐν οἴκῳ 82—κατ' οἶκον 81
-οῖν in infin. 53
οἷος double use of, 93
ὀλίγος 44
ὀλλύναι aor. and perfect 147
ὁμολογεῖν : with ἐν 104—with ptc. or acc. and inf. 229—with ὅτι-clause 229
ὀναίμην 195

ὄνομα: c. ἐν and ἐπί 68—c. εἰς 100
ὀπίσω 99
ὁποῖος double use of 93
ὁπότε "when" 168
ὅπου with ἄν 167, 168, 186
ὄπωπα 111
ὅπως: representing main purpose, followed by artic. inf. 220—with future imperatively 177—c. fut. with μή for οὐ 185—with optative in Atticists 197—replaced by ἵνα with subj. 177 n., 178, 206 f.
ὁρᾶν: why defective 110 f.—has no aorist 111 (see ἰδεῖν)—perfect (ἑώρακα) durative 111—future mid. (ὄψομαι) 155—its compound with κατά 117—ὅρα μή 124, 178, 193
ὀργίζεσθαι: no perfective 117, 118—constative aor. not in NT 118
ὄρνιξ 45
ὄρθρου βαθέως gen. of time 73
ὅς: replaced by τίς 21, 93—for ὅστις 91 f.—in indirect question 93—attraction 93—reinforced with demonstrative 13, 94 f., 237, 249—ὃς ἐάν 42, 234—ὃς ἄν with aor. subj. 186—with future ? 240
-οσαν imperf. and 2nd aor. 52 n.
ὅσος: double use of 93—c. ἄν 16
ὅσπερ 92
ὀστέων 33, 48
ὅστις: limited use of 91 f.—use by Luke and Matt. 92—for classical ὅσπερ 92—replaced by τίς 93—ἕως ὅτου 91
ὅταν: "when" instead of "whenever" 168, 248—c. indic. 168, 239—c. subj. originally futuristic 185—c. pres. and aor. subj. 186
ὅτι: for τί in direct question 94—with finite verb replacing accus. and infin. 211, 213—replacing participle 229—like ὥστε ? 209 f.—consecutive 249—replaced by ὡς and πῶς 211—ὅτι μή 171, 239—ὅτι οὐ 171—μὴ ὅτι 240—οὐχ ὅτι 240—ὡς ὅτι 212
οὐ, οὐκ, οὐχ: relation to μή 169-171—negatives a fact 232—or a single word 171, 232—in LXX translating לא 189, 232—in questions 170, 177—with futuristic subj. originally 184—c. *indic.* 170—εἰ οὐ in simple conditions 171 (*ter*), 187, 200, 240—in unfulfilled conditions (indic. irrealis) 200—with future 177—imperatival use in questions 177—c. *optative* 197—c. *participle* 25, 171, 230-232—in relative sentences 171
οὐ μή: statistics 35, 187-192—weakened force of 39—connected with "translation Greek" 39, 188 f., 191 f.—in words of Christ 191 f.—is it an emphatic negative ? 39, 188-190, 192—in LXX translating לא 189—is οὐ in οὐ μή separate from μή ? 188, 249—in questions 189—c. future 190—c. aor. subj. 190—in relative clauses 189
οὐαί: without verb 180—with ἀπό 246
οὐδέν replacing οὐ 170
οὐθείς and οὐδείς 56
-οῦν infin. 53
-οῦς -οῦδος nouns 38
-οῦσαν 3 pl. imperf. 52
-οῦσθε and -οῦτε subj. 54
οὐχ before words with smooth breathing 44, 244
οὐχ ὅτι 240
ὄφελον 200 f.
ὀφθαλμός Hebraistic locution with 81
ὀψέ c. gen. 72 f.
ὄψησθε 151
ὄψομαι 155
-όω verbs: infin. 53—3 pl. imperf. 52—pres. subj. 54

παθητός 222
παιδίον: illiterate παιδίν 48—παιδία meaning 170 n.
παῖς use of voc. 235
πάλαι with present rendered by our perf. 119
παρά: with gen. dat. acc. 63, 106—frequency 98, 106—with *dative* almost entirely of persons 103, 106—with *accus.* after positive for comparison 236—with *gen.* οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ 106 f.—close to ἀπό, ἐκ, ὑπό 237—encroached upon by ἀπό 102, 246—force in composition 247
παραβολεύεσθαι c. dative 64
παραγγέλλειν: aoristic pres. 119—c. ἵνα 207
παραινεῖν c. infin. 205
παρακαλεῖν c. infin. and ἵνα c. subj. 205, 208 n.
παραπίπτειν 247
παραπλήσιον 99
παρασκευάζεσθαι force of middle 156
παρελάβοσαν 52
παρέχειν irreg. middle 248
παριστάνειν pres. and aor. 129
πᾶς: "Hebraistic" 245 f.—after ἄνευ, χωρίς 246
πάσχειν voice forms 154
πατήρ: anarthrous 82 f.—vocative 71, 245
πειθαρχεῖν c. dat. and gen. 64
πείθειν: differentiation of tenses 147—voice forms 154—πέπεισμαι as a *perfectum præsens* ? 147—active and middle 158
πεῖν: for πιεῖν 44, 45—as indeclinable noun with εἰς 81, 216 249

πειράζειν c. infin. 205
πίεσαι 54
πέποιθα 147 (*bis*), 154
πέπονθα 154
πέπρακα aoristic 145
περί: c. gen. and accus. 104 f.—no longer with dative 105 f.—frequency 98, 104 f.—relations with ἀμφί 100—with ὑπέρ 105—with articular infin. in inscriptions 214
περιπατεῖν translating הלך in ethical sense 11
πεσοῦμαι 155
πεφίμωσο 176
πίνειν: πεῖν 44 f., 81, 216—πίεσαι 54—future an old subj. 184—fut. middle 155
πιπράσκειν aoristic perfect, 145
πίπτειν: action in aorist 134—fut. middle 155
πιστεύειν constructions 67 f., 235
πλεῖστος: generally elative 79—used for comparative in D 236
πλείω indecl. 50
πλεονεκτεῖν c. accus. 65
πλήν 86, 171, 241
πλήρης indecl. 50, 244
πλοῦτος flexion 60
ποδήρην accus. 49
ποίας gen. of place 73
ποιεῖν: imperfect and aorist action 109, 128 (see ἐποίησεν)—with noun instead of middle 159—μὴ ποίει 124–126, 247—μὴ ποιήσῃς 125, 173, 177 f.—c. ἵνα 208—καλῶς ποιεῖν c. partic. 131, 173, 228 f.
ποῖος relations with τίς 95
πολεμεῖν: case government 64—with μετά 106, 247
πορεύεσθαι: active obsolete 162—πορευθείς pleonastic 231—in ethical sense 11 n.
ποταπός meaning and history 95
πότερος replaced by τίς 77
ποῦ gen. of place 73
πραγματεύεσθαι with its perfective 118
πράσσειν: σσ or ττ 25, (45)—no perfective in NT 117—εὖ πράσσειν 228 f.
πρίν: with and without ἄν 169—replaced by πρὸ τοῦ c. infin. 100—c. infin. 169 n.—c. subj. 169—c. optative 169, 199
πρὶν ἤ: c. optative 169 n.—πρὶν ἢ ἄν c. subj. 169—c. infin. 169 n.
πρό: frequency 98, 100—πρὸ τοῦ c. infin. 100, 214—without ἄν 169—a seeming Latinism 100 f.—πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων 101 f.
πρός: with gen., dat., accus. 106—almost confined to accus. in NT 63, 106—frequency 63, 98, 106—in LXX 106—πρὸς τό c. infin. 218, 220—statistics 218—in papyri 220—final force 218, 220
προσέχειν: c. dative 157—introducing a prohibition 193—c. ἵνα 208 n.—c. ἀπό 102 n.
προσκαλεῖσθαι force of middle 157
προσκυνεῖν c. dat. and accus. 64, 66, 245
προστίθεσθαι: c. dat. 67—c. infin. 233
προσφάγιον meaning 170 n.
προσφέρειν: alleged aoristic action of pres. stem 129, 238, 247—perfect and imperf. 129
προσφωνεῖν c. dat. and accus. 65
πρόσωπον Hebraic 14, 81, 99 f.
πρότερος relations with πρῶτος 79, 107
πρῶτος: with gen. for πρότερος 79, 245—as ordinal partly replaced by εἷς 95 f., 237—in LXX 107—πρώτιστα 236
πώποτε with perfect 144
πῶς: encroaches upon ὡς 211—used for ὅτι 211

-ρα- = vocalic r 119 n.
-ρᾰ nouns in, 38, 48
ῥεῖν: not used in middle 153—fut. mid. replaced by active 154
ῥῆμα 111
-ρρ-, -ρσ- 45

-σ- in infin. and indic. aorist 204
-σσ- and -ττ- 25, 45
-σαι in 2 s. mid. pres. and fut. 53 f.
-σαν 3rd plural in, 33, 37 (*ter*), 52
σήπειν: voice forms 154—σέσηπα 154
-σθωσαν in imper. 53
Σκευᾶς 246
σκόπει μή in warnings 184 f., 192
σκύλλειν: meaning 89—voices 156
-σο 2 pers. ending 161
σπᾶν voices 157
σπείρης 38, 48
σπουδάζειν: future 154—c. infin. 205 f.—c. ἵνα in Polybius 206
στήκειν: from ἕστηκα 238
στοιχεῖν 11
στόμα in "Hebraic" locutions 99
σύ: emphasis in nom. 85 f.—σὺ εἶπας *et sim.* 86
συγγενής flexion 49, 244
συγκαλεῖν voice 237
συμβουλεύεσθαι force of middle 157
συμπαραλαμβάνειν: pres. and aorist action 130—aorist ptc. 133
συμπληροῦσθαι durative pres. 233
συμπόσια συμπόσια 97
συμφέρει with subject ἵνα-clause 210
σύν: frequency 98—relations with μετά 106—c. accus. by Aquila 13—with gen. in papyri 64—perfectivising compounds 112 f., 115 f., 148
συναίρειν act. and middle with λόγον, 160

συναλλάσσειν 129
συνάντησις 14 n., 242
συναρπάζειν 113
συνέβη constr. 17, 110
συνεργεῖν c. accus. 65
συνέρχεσθαι 113
συνετός 222
συνθέσθαι 222
συνπ-. See συμπ-
συντελεῖν 118
συντηρεῖν 113, 118
σύστεμα 46
σφυρίς 45
σχήσω 150 (*bis*)
σῴζεσθαι : tenses 127—durative 127, 150—οἱ σῳζόμενοι 127
σωτήρ 84

ταμεῖον 44 f.
τάσσειν c. infin. 205
-τατος superl. ending 78
τέθνηκα perfect of ἀποθνῄσκειν 114 n., 147
τελεῖν : action 118—pres. and aorist action 130—its perfective συντελεῖν 118
τελευτᾶν : "registering" present 120—aor. with ἄρτι 140
τέξομαι fut. mid. 155
-τέος verbal in 222
τεσσαράκοντα 45 f., 244
τέσσαρες : orthography 45 f., 56, 244—accus. 33, 36, 55, 243
τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος 96
τέτ(ε)υχα 56, 154
τηρεῖν perfective 113, 116
τιθέναι : voices 237—relation of τίθημι and τίθεμαι 152
τίκτειν : pres. and aorist 126 f.—future 155
τίνες, τινές 36
τίς : replaces πότερος 77—become τί (indecl.) 95, 244—used as relative 21, 93
τις : supplanted by εἷς 97 f.—with negative 246
-τος verbal in 221 f.
τοῦ : c. infin., perhaps Ionic 205—an adnominal gen. 216—statistics of 216 f.—normal use telic 216—so frequently by Luke 216 f.—purpose rare or absent in Paul 217—use in papyri 219 f.—after verbs of commanding 217—final force weakened 207—use parallel with ἵνα 207, 217—= "so as to" in Paul 218
τοῦ λοιποῦ gen. of time 73
τρέπειν, τραπεῖν 110, 119 n.
-ττ- and -σσ- 25, 45
τυγχάνειν : flexion 56—voice forms 154—τυχόν accus. abs. 74—οὐχ ὁ τυχών 231 n.—c. partic. 228
τυχόν "perhaps" 74
-τωσαν in imper. 53

υ (ϝ) dropped between vowels 47
υ, η, ῃ, ι, οι, ει approximating sounds 34, 240
ὑγεία, ὑγία 38, 45
-υῖα flexion of perf. ptc. in 38, 48
ὑμέτερος 40 n.
ὑμῶν : position of 40 n.,—ousts ὑμέτερος 40 n.
ὑπαντᾶν c. dat. 64
ὑπάντησις 14 n.
ὑπέρ : frequency 98, 104 f.—predominantly gen. 105—often = "about" 105—in commercial "to" 105—relations with περί and ἀντί 105—with accus. 105, 237—in compound adverbs 99
ὑπεράνω 99
ὑπό : c. dative 63, 105 f.—frequency 98, 104 f.—compared with διά (gen.) 106—encroached upon by ἀπό 102—relations with ἀπό, ἐκ, παρά 237—ἀποθνῄσκειν ὑπό τινος 156—in compound adverbs 99
ὑποκάτω 99
ὑποτάσσεσθαι : middle or pass. 163—future 149, 163
ὑποτρέχειν c. accus. 65

φαγεῖν see ἐσθίειν—as indecl. noun 249
φάγεσαι 54
φάγομαι 155, 184 n.
φαίνεσθαι : action in future 150—with ptc. 228
φάναι : punctiliar 128—ἔφη 110, 128
φέρειν : why defective 110—no aorist action 110—in imperf. 129, 238—aoristic (?) use of pres. stem 129, 238—force of perfect ἐνήνοχα 154—relation between φέρουσι and φέρων 224
φεύγειν : and its perfective 112, 116—pres. and aorist action 115 f., 119—future middle 155
φιμοῦσθαι perfect and aorist imper. 176
φοβεῖσθαι : active obsolete 102 n., 162—action in future 150—with ἀπό 102, 104 n.—with μή 184 f., 193—with μήπως 248—with infin. 205
φροντίζειν c. ἵνα or infin. 206 f.
φυλάσσειν : action in aorist 116—its perfective 116—force of middle 157, 159
φυσιοῦσθε subj. 54

χαίρειν : pres. and aor. action 129—voice 161—pronunciation of χαίρει 34—epistolary use 179 f., 245
χάρις flexion 49
χεῖν, future 184

χειμῶνος gen. of time 73
χείρ: accus. χεῖραν 49—διὰ χειρός 100—in "Hebraic" locutions 99 f.
χείριστος: in papyri 236—not in NT 78
χείρων strictly comparative in NT 78
χορηγεῖν c. accus. 65
χρᾶσθαι: flexion 54—voice 158—action in aorist 247—c. accus. 64, 245—c. instrumental 64, 158
Χριστός Paul's phrase ἐν Χ. 68
χρόνος instrumental dat. of duration 75, 148
χρυσοῦς flexion 33, 48
-χύννειν 45
χωρεῖν: future 155—infin., future and aor. 205 n.

ψυχή periphrasis for ἑαυτόν 87, 105 n.

υ, ο pronounced alike 35 (*bis*), 244, 249

-ω and -ῶ verbs, from -μι 33, 38
ὦ in classical and Hellenistic Greek 71
ὥραν point of time 63, 245
ὡς: c. indic., with ἄν 167—with ὅτι 212—in papyri 212—for ὅτι replaced by πῶς 211—c. subj. 185, 249—with ἄν 167—without ἄν 249—c. optative, in LXX 196—in Josephus etc. 197—c. infin., ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν 204 n.
ὥστε: statistics 209—= "and so" or "therefore" 209 f.—difference between indic. and infin. 209—with indic. consecutive rare 209, 210—c. imperative 209—c. subj. 209—c. infin. 209—expresses purpose 207, 210—Tatian's misreading of it 249
ὤφθην 111. See ὁρᾶν

Modern Greek.

PAGE
ἄν *if* 167
ἀπό c. acc. 102, 245
ἀποκρίθηκα 39
ἄς=ἄφες 175, 176
-ᾶς gen. ᾶδος, nouns in 38
αὐτός, Pontic ἀτός 47, 91
ἀχ (Epirot)=ἐξ 102

βάθρακος 38
βρῆκα=εὕρηκα 142

γενάμενος 51
γιὰ νά *in order that* 159

δαιμονίζω 162
δέν=οὐδέν 170, 232
δένοντας indecl. pres. partic. 60
διά c. acc. 106

ἐβδάσταξα 56
ἐδέθηκα 142
εἰποῦμε 1. pl. subj. of εἶπα 185
ἐκ 102, 246
ἔλεγε and εἶπε 128
ἕνας=εἷς 96
ἔπαψα=ἔπαυσα 234
ἔρευνα 46
ἐστάθηκα, ἐστήθηκα 162
ἐσύ=σύ 234
εὕρηκα 142
ἔφερα aor. of φέρνω=φέρω 129
(ἐ)φέτο=ἐφ' ἔτος 44
ἔφθασα 247

ἦρθα=ἦλθα 12

θά, θενά auxil. forming future 179, 185

ἴδιος 91
-ις, -ιν nouns in 48 f., 244

PAGE
καθείς, καθένας *each* 105
καί, κι' 12
κάμνω (aor. ἔκαμα) *make* 159
κἄν 167
κἄτι 244

μέ=μετά 106
μέρα=ἡμέρα 235
μή(ν) c. subj. 122, 170
μὴ γένοιτο 194, 240, 249
μήπως 248

νά=ἵνα 157, 159, 176, 205

ὀρνίχ=ὄρνις (Pontic) 45
-οῦς gen. -οῦδος, nouns in 38
ὀχ (Epirot)=ἐξ 102

παιδιά (pl. of παιδί *child*) 170
παρά compounded 247
πᾶσα 244
'πῇς=εἴπῃς 176
ποιός interrogative 95
πολεμῶ μέ 106, 247
ποῦ relative (indeclinable) 94

σάν (=ὡς ἄν) *when, as* 17, 167
σαράντα (σεράντα) *forty* 46, 234
στέκω=στήκω 162, 238
στήνω=ἱστάνω 55, 162
στό(ν) dat. of ὁ (=εἰς τόν) 63
συνέβηκε=συνέβη 17

τετράδη *Wednesday* 96

φέρνω 129

χύννω (Cypriote) 45

ὡς=ἕως 249
ὡς πότε 107

III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

ℵ—see *Sinaiticus*
A—see *Alexandrinus*
Ablative case: lost in prehistoric Greek 61—as a part of the genitive 72—alleged Latinisms 101 f.
Ablaut 152
Absolute: genitive 12, 74, 236—accusative 74
Accent (stress): differentiating voices 152, 238—distinguishing words 237
Accusative: and infinitive 16 f., 211 f., 229—pl. in -ες 36—sg. in -ν 49—3rd decl. and mixed 49—terminal 61—with prepositions, compared with dat. and gen. 62—with εἰς, encroaching on ἐν c. dat. 62 f., 234 f.—with other preps. supplanting dat. 63—for point of time 63—specification 63—encroaching on other cases as object case with verbs—on dat. 64, 65—on gen. 64 f., 235—with verbs formerly intransitive 65—internal or adverbial 65, 93—how far the old distinctions of cases still hold here 66—constr. of πιστεύω 67 f., 235—with εἰς replacing a predicate 71 f.—absolute 74—substituted for nominative c. inf. 212—mixed with ὅτι construction 213
Achaian-Dorian Κοινή 37
Action-form, verbal 108–118, 221 *al*—see *Aorist*, *Perfect*, *Present*, *Future*; *Linear*, *Punctiliar*, *Perfective*, *Constative*, *Iterative*, *Ingressive*, *Effective*.
Active Voice 152 ff.—see *Middle*
Acts: relations of first and second part 11, 216, 235—unity with Lk 14, 217—the "We"-document 217—see *Luke*
Adjectives: pronominal 40, 79 f., 87–91—indeclinables 50—"Duality" 77 f.—comparison 78 f.—position, with article and noun 84—interjectional 181 f., 240—verbal 221 f.
Adverbs: prepositions κατά and ἀνά used as 105—in composition 112
Aelian 25, 79
Aeolic 37, 38, 44, 214—cf *Lesbian*
Aeschylus 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
Agent: ἀπό for ὑπό expressing 102, 246
Agent-nouns 127
Agrapha 130, 171, 191
Ahiḳar, Story of 238 f.
Aktionsart—see *Action-form*
Alexander the Great 7, 30
Alexandrian Greek 40, 52
Alexandrinus, Codex 36, 47, 54, 76, 191, 194, 240 *al*
Alkman, 24
α-text 42, 53, 175, 176, 190, 225
American RV 180
Ammonius 160
Anabasis, effect of the expedition on Greek dialects 31
Anacoluthon 58, 69, 95, 180, 223, 224, 225, 234
Analogy-formations 37, 38, 44, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56
Anaphoric article 83
Anarthrous: infinitive with prepositions 81, 216—prepositional phrases 81 f., 236—nouns in "headings" 82—use of nouns with qualitative force 82 f.—proper names 83—adjective clauses 83 f., 236—infin., statistics 241
Aorist: subjunctive c. οὐ μή 35, 190—endings 51 f.—action-form 109–111, 113, 115–118, 129 f., 132, 238—subjunctive, closely connected with fut. indic. 120, 149, 240—indicative, compared with imperfect 128 f.—partic. 130–134, 227, 238—timeless uses 134—as past indefinite 134 f., 135–140—expressing *immediate* past 134 f., 139, 140—epistolary 135—gnomic 135—English rendering 135–140—compared with perfect 141–146—passive and middle 161 f.—subjunctive after compounds of ἄν 166, 186—no longer used with ἄν iterative 167—imperative, tone of 173, 189—3rd person in prohibition 174 f.—contrasted with imperatival pres. partic. 180—in unrealised condition, wish, or purpose 200 f.

Aoristic: presents 119, 247—*φέρω* 129, 238, 247—perfects 141–146, 238, 248
Apocalypse: grammatical level 9—use of cases and neglect of concord 9, 60—bearing of grammar here on criticism 9 f.—use of *ἰδού* 11—possible acc. pl. in *-ες* 36, and sg. 3rd decl. in *-αν* 49—person-endings 52—nominative 69—prohibitions 124—aoristic perfects 145—*οὐ μή* 191, 192—*τοῦ* c. inf. 217, 218—does not confuse *εἰς* and *ἐν* in local sense 234—small use of compound verbs 237
Apocrypha, RV of 198
Apotheosis 84
Appian: dative 63—optative 197
Aquila 13—see Index I (*e*), p. 264
Aramaic: influences on Greek in NT 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 75, 95, 103, 104, 124, 174, 189, 224, 226 f., 230 f., 235, 236, 240, 242—periphrastic imperfect 14, 226 f.—speech of Paul 7—of Jesus 8—of John 9—diction in Luke 14–18—ordinals 96—tenses 139—participle 182—periphrastic imperative 226 f.—see under *Hebraism* and *Over-use*
Arcadian 38
Archimedes 51
Aristophanes 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
Arrian, optative in 197—see Index I (*e*), p. 264
Article: use by foreigners 21, 236—general "correctness" of NT Greek 81—as relative and as demonstrative 81—dropped between preposition and infin. 81, 216—these three Ionic uses absent from NT 81—alleged Hebraisms 81 f., 236—correlation 81 f.—anarthrous prepositional phrases 82, 236—dropped in sentences having the nature of headings 82—words specially affecting anarthrous form 82—qualitative force of anarthrous words 82 f.—with proper names 83—used with the parent's name in gen. 83, 236—with names of slaves and animals 83—*ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* 83—colloquial style drops art. before adjective adjuncts 83 f., 236—misplacement of adjective 84—*τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, papyrus parallels 84—complex adjectival clause between art. and noun 236
Articular Infinitive: *ἐν τῷ* in translation 14, 215, 249—bearing on history of *Κοινή* 34, 213-215—rare anarthrous use with prepositions 81, 216—appropriate to rhetoric 189, 213, 215—statistics for classical and later Greek 213, 215—for NT 213, 216—for Greek Bible 241—citations from dialect inscriptions 214—essentially literary, specially Attic 214 f.—use with dependent gen., as if a full noun 215—*τοῦ* c. inf., without preposition, its original adnominal use 216—telic force in Thucydides and in NT 216—usage of the several NT writers in this respect 217—Paul's tendency to drop telic force 217—parallelism with *ἵνα* 217—explanatory infin. 218—*πρὸς τό* and *εἰς τό*, how far remaining telic 218 f.—papyrus citations for *τοῦ*, *εἰς τό*, *πρὸς τό* c. inf. 219 f.—belongs mainly to higher educational stratum 220.
Articular Nominative in address 70, 235
Articular Participle 126 f., 228
Asia Minor: characteristics of Greek 38, 40 f., 205, 211
Aspiration 44, 234, 236, 244
Assimilation of Cases: after verbs of naming 69, 235—omitted with gen. abs. 74, 236
Asyndeton 17, 181
Attendant Circumstances, participle of 230
Attic: literary supremacy 24—its earliest use in prose 25—grammar of inscriptions 29—Xenophon 31—language of the lower classes in Athens 31—the basis of literary *Κοινή* 32—how much did it contribute to the vernacular *Κοινή*? 33 f., 41, 214 f.—nom. pl. as accus. 37—*κεκτῶμαι* and *μεμνῶμαι* 54—*κατέχεα* 55—revival of the dual 57—parenthetic nominative 70—use of vocative, divergent from Hellenistic 71—historic present 121—the Orators, forms of prohibition 124, use of imperative 172—alleged ex. of aoristic perfect 146, 238—linear and punctiliar futures 150—active verbs with future middle 154 f.—*ἀπεκρινάμην* 161—optative in conditional sentences 196 f.—imperfect in unfulfilled condition 201—*ὅπως* and *ἵνα* 206—*ὡς ὅτι* 212—articular infin. mainly due to Orators 213–215—nom. for acc. in long enumerations 234—see under the Attic writers' names and in Index I (*e*), p. 256
Atticism 5, 22, 24 f., 26, 170, 197, 206, 211, 239
Attraction of Relative 92 f.
Augment 51, 128, 129
Authorised Version 93, 98, 112, 128 f., 136–140, 189
Auxiliary *ἄφες* 175 f.

B—see *Vaticanus*

β-text 42, 53, 224—see under *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*

Bezae, Codex 16, 38, 42, 50, 55, 56, 58, 69, 73, 80, 94, 96, 107, 114, 124, 131, 161, 171, 228, 233, 235, 236, 240, 241, 242 *al*—see under *δ-text*

Biblical Greek, 2–5, 18, 99

Bilingualism: in Rome 5—illustrated from Wales 6 f., 10 f.—in Egypt 6—in Lystra 7, 233—in Palestine 7 f., 233

Bœotian 33, 34, 55, 214

Bohairic 225

Brachylogy, with ἀλλά 241

Broken continuity, perfect of 144, 145, 148

Byzantine period 88, 96, 168, 197

Cappadocian—see *Pontic*

Cardinals: encroachment on ordinals 95 f., 237—simplification of the "teens" 96—uses of εἷς 96 f.—repetition for distributive 97

Cases: in Rev 9—history 60–76, 234–236—with prepositions 100–107, 237—see under the several Cases.

Catholic Epistles, use of compound verbs 237—see under *First Ep. of Peter*, *James*, *Second Ep. of Peter*

Causal Participle 230

Cautious assertion 188, 192 f.

Chance in the Bible 219

Christians, ethics of average early 126, 238

Chrysostom, on ecbatic ἵνα 207—see Index I (*e*), p. 264

Clement of Rome 95—see Index I (*e*), p. 264

Colloquial—see under *Vernacular*

Common Greek: takes place of "Hebraic" in definition of NT Greek 1—a universal language 5 f., 19—materials for study 22 f.—literary Κοινή (*q.v.*)—papyri, inscriptions, MGr 27–30—unification of earlier Greek dialects 30—foreshadowings of this during v/iv B.C. 21—completed in time of Alexander 31 f.—decay of the old dialects 32—their relative contributions to the resultant Κοινή 32–34, 36 f., 214 f.—pronunciation 34 f. how far was Κοινή homogeneous? 19, 38–41—dialects in (*q.v.*)

Comparison of adjectives and adverbs 77–79, 236

Complementary Infinitive 204

Compound Prepositions 99

Compound Verbs: cases with 65—perfective action 111–118, 237—repeated without preposition 111, 115—statistics 237

Conative action 125, 127, 128 f., 147 173 f., 186, 247

Concessive Participle 230

Concord 9, 28, 59 f., 182, 244

Conditional Sentences: pluperfect in 148—apodosis with ἄν 166 f., 196, 197–199, 200 f.—ἐάν c. indic. 168, 187—εἰ μήτι ἄν 169—εἰ μή in unfulfilled condition, εἰ οὐ in simple 171, 200, 240—futuristic subj. with ἐάν 185—its future-perfect sense in aor. 186—lessened difference between εἰ and ἐάν 187, 240—these almost exclusively confined to their proper moods 187—εἰ c. deliberative subj. 187—differentia of εἰ and ἐάν in future conditions 187—use of optative 195, 196, 197 f.—unfulfilled conditions 199–201—participle in protasis 229 f.

Conjugation-stems 109 f., 120

Conjunctions: with ἄν (ἐάν) 166, 284—ἀλλά "except" 241

Conjunctive participle 230

Consecutive clauses: infinitive alone 204, 210—ὥστε with indic. and with infin. 209 f.—expressed by ἵνα 210—by τοῦ c. infin. 218

Constative action 109, 111, 113, 115–118, 130, 133, 145, 174

Construct state (Semitic) 236

Contingent ἄν 166, 198, 200

Contract Verbs, 37, 52–54, 55, 234

Contraction of *i* sounds 45, 55

Correlation of Article 81 f.

Cretan 214, 233—see *Gortyn*

Criticism, contributions of grammar to 9 f., 40 f.

Culture—see *Education*

D—see *Bezae*

Dative: lost in MGr 60, 63—obsolescent in Κοινή 62—decays through a period of over-use, esp. with ἐν 62—statistics with prepositions 62 f.—confusion of εἰς and ἐν 63, 66, 234 f.—decay of dative uses with ὑπό and πρός 63—with ἐπί, distinct meaning lost 63, 107—accus. begins to express point of time 63—reaction, as in extension of dative (instrumental) of reference 63, 75, and in some transitive verbs taking dative 64—verbs beginning to take accus. or gen. instead of dat. 64—illiterate uses of gen. and acc. for dat. 64—some improbable citations from early inscriptions 64—with προσκυνεῖν 64, 66—with some compound verbs 65—with πιστεύειν 67 f.—*incommodi* 75—syncretism with locative 75 f., 104—with instrumental 75—exten-

sion of time and point of time thus both given by dative 75 f.—sociative instrumental 75—instrumental used in translating Hebrew infin. abs. 75—this and use of participle compared with classical uses and with LXX 76—various uses of *ἐν* 103 f.—dat. of person judging 104—common uses of dat. and loc. in Greek and Sanskrit 104—*ἐν* added even to instrumental dative 104—*ὁμολογεῖν ἐν* 104—*μετά*, *περί*, *ὑπό* no longer c. dat. 105—one or two exceptions with *ὑπό* 105—*πρός* c. dat. common in LXX, rare in NT 106—*ἐπί* indifferently with the three cases 107—*ἐφ' ᾧ* 107—dative of reflexive approximates to force of the Middle 157—*χρᾶσθαι* with instrumental 158—dat. or loc. of a verbal noun makes the Infinitive 202–204—articular infin. (*q.v.*)
Days of week and month 96, 101, 237
De-aspiration—see *Psilosis*
Defective Verbs 110 f.
Definite nouns, in Semitic 236
Definition, gen. of 73 f.
Deliberative Subjunctive 171, 185, 187, 194
𝔡-text 14, 44, 45, 53, 181, 233, 234—see under *Bezae*
Delphian, 36, 37, 52, 55, 214
Demonstrative: article as 81—*αὐτός* and *ἐκεῖνος* 91
Demosthenes 213—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
Denial and Prohibition, with *οὐ μή* 187 f.
Deponents 153 f., 161 f.
Dialects in ancient Hellas 23 f., 30–34, 36–38, 41, 213 f.—see under *Attic*, *Ionic*, etc.
Dialects in Κοινῇ 5 f., 19, 28 f., 38–41, 47, 91, 94, 205, 209, 211, 241, 243, 249
Digamma 23, 38, 44, 47, 111, 244
Diodorus, optative in 197
Diphthongs: pronunciation 33, 34 f.—augment 51
Dissimilation 45
Distributive numerals 97
Doric, 33, 41, 45, 48, 51, 101, 214
Double comparative and superlative 236
Dual 57 f., 77 f.
Duality 77–80, 100
Durative action—see *Linear*
Dynamic Middle 158

Ecbatic *ἵνα* 206–209
Education, varieties of: in NT writers 8 f., 28, 44, 50, 52, 60—in papyri, etc. 4, 6 f., 9, 28, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52—see under *Illiteracy*; also under *Apocalypse*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *Paul*, *Hebrews*, etc.
Effective action 109, 113, 130, 149
Egypt, bilingualism in, xvii f., 6, 242
Elative 78, 79, 236
Elis, dialect of 178, 214
Elision 45
Ellipsis 178, 180, 181, 183, 190
Emphasis: in pronouns 85 f.—imperfect and aorist differing in 128—possible cause of original voice-differentiation 152, 238—on subject, brought out by English preterite 140—degree of, in *οὐ μή* construction 188–190—of *οὐ* c. partic. 232—differentiating words of full or attenuated meaning 237
English, Hellenistic illustrated from 19, 39, 58, 71, 77, 79, 82, 85, 89, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 111, 112, 135–140, 144, 150 f., 171 f., 182, 184, 185, 189, 195, 203, 206, 218, 221 f., 229, 236, 243
Epexegetic infinitive 217, 218, 219
Epimenides 233
Epistolary aorist 135—formulæ 28, 176, 180
Euripides 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
"Exhausted" *ἑαυτοῦ* and *ἴδιος* 87–90. 237

Final clauses: weakened telic force of *ἵνα* 178, 205–210, 240 f., of *τοῦ* c. infin. 207, 216–218, of *εἰς τό* c. infin., in Paul 219—originated in volitive, with parataxis 185—final optative with *ἵνα* 196 f.—*ὥστε* c. infin. used for purpose 207—*τοῦ* c. infin. 216–218—*πρὸς τό* and *εἰς τό* c. infin. 218–220—use of participle 230
Final *ι* and *ν* 49, 168, 187
First Epistle of Peter: prohibitions 124—preference for aorist imperative 174—for imperatival participles 181—*οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ* improbable in such good Greek 237
Fluellen 10 f.
Fourth Book of Maccabees, Atticising in 166, 197
Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse 9 f.
French idioms in English 13
Frequency, relative, of prepositions 62 f., 98, 100, 102, 105, 106 f.
Frequentative verb, 114
Future: c. *ἵνα* 35—c. *οὐ μή* 35, 190—c. *ἐφ' ᾧ* 107—in Indo-Germanic verb 108—compared with futural present 120—history of its form 149—links with subjunctive 149, 184, 187, 240—action mixed 149 f.—English rendering 150 f.—volitive

and futuristic uses 150 f.—its moods 151—Middle in active verbs 154 f.—Passive with middle force 161—used for imperative 176 f.—ditto with ὅπως 177—rarely with μή in prohibition 177—in warning with μή 178—c. εἰ 187—c. μή in cautious assertion 193—optative 197—infinitive 204 f.—participle 230
Future Conditions: with ἐάν 185—with εἰ 187—"less vivid form" 196, 199
Futuristic: future 150, 177—subjunctive 184, 185, 186, 192, 240

Gender 59 f.
Genitive: absolute 12, 74, 236—verbs with 65, 235—with ἀκούειν and γεύεσθαι 66—syncretism with ablative 72—objective and subjective 72—partitive 72 f., 102—with ὀψέ 72, 73—time and place 73—definition 73 f.—Hebraism here 74—after negative adjective 74, 235 f.—prepositions with 100–102, 104–107, 237—of material 102
German, illustrations from 94, 96
Gerundive in -τέος 222
Gnomic aorist 135, 139—present 135—future 186
Gortyn Code 214—cf *Cretan*
Gothic 78, 181, 224
Grammar and literary criticism 9, 40 f., 205, 211
Grammatical and lexical Semitism 12
Greece, physical conditions of 23 f.

Headings, anarthrous 82
Hebraism: in theory of NT Greek 1–3—in Rev 9—use of ἐν xvii, 11 f., 61, 103—cf Gallicisms in English 13—ἐν τῷ c. inf. 14, 215, 249—in Lk 14–18—tested by MGr 17, 94—εἰς predicate 72, 76—articular nom. in address 70, 235—gen. of definition 73 f.—gen. abs. 74—dat. or partic. for infin. abs. 75 f.—use of article 81, 236—redundance of pronouns 85—ψυχή used for reflexive 87, 105—relative with superfluous demonstrative 94 f.—εἷς as ordinal 95 f.—and as indef. art. 96 f.—distrib. num. 21, 97—illustrated by AV 98—ἐνώπιον 99—compound prepositions 99—ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 131—active for middle 158—infin. for imper. 180—Hebrew teleology and final clauses 219—*nom. pendens* c. partic. 225—periphrastic tenses 226 f.—freedom of Mk from 242—cf under *Over-use*
Hebraist school of NT interpretation 2 f., 12, 223, 242
Hebrew: how far known in Palestine 8, 233—NT (Delitzsch) 104, 163—tenses 108
Hebrews, Epistle to: did author know Aramaic? 10—Greek style of 18, 20, 118, 129, 232, 237—grammatical points in 62, 129, 182, 211, 217, 218 f., 231, 237
Hebrews, Gospel of 17—see Index I (*e*), p. 265
Hellenistic 2—see *Common Greek*
Heracleon 104
Herculaneum, papyri from, 27, 43
Hermogenes 172
Herodian: cases in 63—optative 197
Herodotus 51, 62, 81, 91, 101, 214, 215—see also Index I (*e*), p. 263
Heteroclisis 48, 60
Hiatus 92, 117
Historic Present, 120 f., 139
Homer: the Achæans of 24—forms found in 55—syntax 121, 135, 147, 161—the Athenians' "Bible" 142—blamed by Protagoras for use of imperative 172—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
Hypotaxis—see under *Parataxis*

Ignatius 215
Illiteracy 28, 36, 43, 49, 56, 78, 87, 93, 142, 169, 189, 220, 237, 238, 239
Imperative: endings 53—of εἰμί 56, 174—present, compared with aor. subj. in prohibition 122–126—tenses compared generally 129 f., 173 f., 176, 189, 238—prehistoric use 164—formal history, 165, 171 f.—tone of 172 f., 175—prominence of in NT 173—aorist appropriate in prayer 173—in 3rd person 174 f.—expressions for 1st person 175 f.—auxiliary ἄφες 175 f.—perfect 176—substitutes for 176–182, 203, 223, 241, 248
Imperfect 128 f.—in unreal indic. 200 f.—replaced by periphrasis 226 f.—see *Present stem*
Impersonal plural 58 f.—verbs 74, 226
Improper Prepositions 99
Inceptive action of -ισκω suffix 120
Incommodi, Dativus 75
Indeclinable: Greek proper name not to be taken as 12—πλήρης, ἥμισυ and comparatives in -ω 50
Indefinite Article 96 f.
Indicative: alone may have inherent time-connotation 126, 128, 129—imperfect 128 f.—aorist, used of immediate past 135, 140—rendering of aorist in English 135–140—γέγονα not aoristic in NT 145 f., 238—pluperfect 148—future 149–151—as *modus irrealis* 164, 199-201—with ἄν 166 f., 200 f.—with ὅταν, ὅπου ἄν, ὅσοι ἄν ἐάν 168, 239—negatived by οὐ 170 f.

—but μή not entirely expelled 170 f., 239 f.—negatived questions 170—future used for command 176 f., 240—future with οὐ μή 190—c. μή in cautious assertions 192 f.—imperfect for present time in unfulfilled condition, wish, and purpose 200 f.—replaced by participle 222–224—periphrasis 225–227
Indirect Questions 196, 198 f.
Indo-Germanic: dual in 57 f.—numerals 58—cases 61, 72, 75—verb system 108 f.—*Aktionsart* 109 f.—perfectivising by means of composition 111 f.—aorist-present in 119—augment and the final *-i* in primary tenses 128—was there a future in? 149—future participle 151—voice, its rationale in 152, 238—no separate passive 152—verbs with no middle 153—strong perfect without voice distinction 154—passive use of middle already developing in 156—Greek weak aorist passive developed from middle person-ending *-thēs* 161—differentia of the imperative 164, 171 f.—glottogonic theories of subjunctive and optative 164—the injunctive 165—the two negatives 169—jussive subjunctive in positive commands 177 f.—origins of the infinitive 202 f.—its deficiency in voice 203, and tense 204—verbal adjectives and participles 221 f.—closeness of 3 pl. act. in *-ont*(*i*) to the participle 224
Infinitive: c. ἐν τῷ 14, 215—forms in contract verbs 53—future 151, 204 f.—for imperative 172, 179 f., 203—articular (*q.v.*) 189, 213–220, 240—verb and noun 202—its origins 202–204—comparisons with Sanskrit, Latin, English—202–204, 207, 210—development of voice 203, and of tense 204—case-uses traced 203 f., 207, 210—anarthrous expressing purpose 204, 205, 207, 217, 240 f.—consequence 204, 210—complementary 204—limitative 204—relations with ἵνα c. subj. 205–209, 210 f., 240 f.—with ὥστε final 207, 210—alleged Latinism 208—consecutive with ὥστε 209 f.—relations with ὥστε c. indic. 209 f., and with consecutive ἵνα 210—subject and object 210 f.—accus. and infin. compared with ὅτι clause 211—accus. tending to replace regular nom. 212—not Latinism 212 f.—mixture of acc. c. inf. and ὅτι construction 213—statistics 241
Ingressive action 109, 116, 117, 118, 130, 131, 145, 149, 174
Injunctive mood 165
Inscriptions: Κοινή 6, 23, 28 f.—classical, 23, 214—see Index I (*c*), pp. 258 f.
Instrumental case 61, 75, 104, 158—use of ἐν 12, 61 f., 75, 104
Interjectional character of voc. and imper. 171 f.—of infin. in imperatival sense 179, 203—of partic. or adj. used imperatively 180 f., 240—prepositional clauses 183 f.
Internal accusative 65, 93
Interrogative: confused with relative 93 f.—ποῖος and τίς, ποταπός 95—command 184
Intransitive: verbs becoming transitive 65, 162—use of strong perfect 147, 154—tendency of strong aorist 155
Ionic 33, 37 f., 41, 43, 44, 48, 51, 55, 57, 81, 101, 195, 205
Ireland, bilingualism in 7
Irrational final ι and ν 49, 168, 187
Isolation of Biblical Greek 2, 3
Itacism 34 f., 47, 56, 199, 239, 240
Iterative action 109, 114, 125, 127, 128, 129, 173, 180, 186, 248—use of ἄν 166, 167, 168

James: ἰδού in 11—prohibitions 126—use of Middle 160
Jerome 181
Jewish Greek 2 f., 19—see *Hebraism* and *Aramaic*
John: Greek of Gospel and Apocalypse 9—place of writing 40 f., 211—use of historic present 121—prohibitions 124, 125, 126—μή in questions 170, 239—periphrastic tenses 226, 227—compound verbs 237
Josephus 2, 23, 25, 62, 89, 121, 146, 189, 197, 233, 235—see Index I (*e*), p. 264
Jussive subjunctive 178, 208—see *Volitive*
Justin Martyr 8, 143, 233—see Index I (*e*), p. 264

Καθαρεύουσα 26, 30—cf *Atticism*, *Literary* Κοινή
Klepht ballads—see Index I (*e*), p. 265
Κοινή 23—see *Common Greek*

Laconian—see *Sparta*
Late Greek 1
Latin: Bible 5, 72, 106, 129, 132, 240—Paul speaking 21, 233—cases 61—use of *we* for *I* 87—parallels with Greek, etc. 112, 158—the Middle 153—subj. and indic. in cause-clauses 171—jussive subj. 177—prohibition 178—*quin redeamus?* 184—optative in indirect question 199—verbal

nouns 202—infinitive 204—*ut* clauses 206—their weakened final force 207 f.—verbal adj. turned into participle 221—participle and adj. in *-bilis* 222—parallels to use of participle for indic. or imper. 223 f., 241—poverty in participles 229 f.
Latinisms 18, 20 f., 71, 75, 100–102, 142, 208, 212 f., 247
Lesbian—see *Aeolic*
Lewis Syriac 53, 65, 72, 248
Lexical notes: *εἰς ἀπάντησιν* 14—*ναῦς* 25 f.—*ἄφιξις* 26—*ἐρωτᾶν* 66—*σκύλλειν* 89—*ἐνώπιον* 99—*ἐπιφανής, ἐπιφάνεια* 102—*ἐπιβαλών* 131—*ἀποκόψονται* 163, 201—*προσφάγιον* 170—*παιδία* 170—*προστίθεσθαι* 232—*εἰκόνες* 235
Lexical: studies of Deissmann 4—Hebraisms 11, 12, 46, 233
Limitative infinitive 204
Linear action 109, 110, 111, 114, 117, 119, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 147, 149 f., 173, 174, 175, 180, 183, 186, 233
Literary element in NT 20, 25 f., 26, 55, 106, 147 f., 204, 211—see under *Hebrews, Paul, Luke*
Literary Κοινή 2 f., 21, 22 f., 24–26, 62 f., 64, 88, 118, 194, 197, 211—its analogue in MGr 21, 26, 30—element in inscriptions 29—see *Atticism*
Lithuanian: alleged Latinising gen. found in 101—future in *-siu* 149
Local cases 60 f.
Localising of textual types 41
Locative 61, 75, 104, 202 f.
Logia 15, 104, 124, 126, 189, 191
Lord's Prayer 10, 173
Lost cases 61
Lucian 25, 170, 197, 227—see Index I (*e*), p. 264
Luke: did he know Aramaic? 10, 15, 104—style 11, 18, 20, 232—Hebraism in 13–18—unity of Lucan writings 14, 217—preserving words of source 15, 18, 106, 237, *contra* 159, 242—construction of *ἐγένετο* for וַיְהִי 16 f., 70, 233—was "Hebrew's Gospel" a source? 26—misusing a literary word? 26—recalling Homer? 26—use of *ὦ* 71—projected third treatise? 79—use of "dual" words 79 f.—*ὅστις* 91 f.—pres. for aor. imper. 119—historic pres. 121—prohibitions 124—iterative *ἄν* 167 f.—optative 165, 195, 198 f.—"correct" use of *πρίν* 169, 199—preference for pres. imper. compared with Mt 174—*ἀρξάμενοι* 182, 240—*οὐ μή* 190 f.—hymns in, their use of infin. 210—acc. c. inf. 211—*τοῦ* c. inf. 216 f.—literary survival of *οὐ* c. partic. 232—his two editions 233—*ἐλαιων* 69, 235—artic. nom. of address 235—*ελάχιστος* 236—compound verbs 237—see *Acts*
LXX—see *Septuagint*
Lycaonian 7 f., 233
Lystra—see *Lycaonian*

Magnesia 29, 38, 43
Manuscripts of NT, orthography tested 42–56
Marcion 114
Mark: uncultured Greek 50, 53, 71—dative 62—*εἰς* and *ἐν* 62—the Middle 159—*ὅταν*, etc. c. indic. 168—subj. in comparisons 185—fut. c. *οὐ μή* 190, 191—optative 195—compound verbs 237—rich in Aramaism 242
Matthew: improves Greek of his source 15, 124, 159, 200, 237, 242—*καὶ ἰδού* 17—historic present 121—prohibitions 124—aorist in 137–140—aoristic *γέγονα* 146—preference for aor. imper. in Sermon on the Mount 174, (119)—*οὐ μή* 190, 191,—*τοῦ* c. inf. 216—superlative *ἐλάχιστος* 236—compound verbs 237
Middle: of *εἰμί* 36 f., 55 f.—with and without expressed personal pronoun (gen. or dat.) 85, 157, 236 f.—primitive differentia 152, 238—in Sanskrit, Latin, and Keltic 153—"Deponents" 153—links with the strong perfect 154, and with future 154 f.—how far reflexive 155 f., 238—evolution of a passive 156—compared with English verbs that are both transitive and intransitive 156 f.—paraphrased by reflexive in dative case 157—typical exx. 157—reciprocal 157—dynamic 158—mental action 158—differences between Attic and Hellenistic 158 f.—"incorrect" uses in NT and papyri 159 f.—Paul not implicated 160—*αἰτεῖν* and *αἰτεῖσθαι* 160 f.—middle and passive aorists 161 f.—verbs in which active became obsolete, or was recoined out of a deponent 162—common ground between middle and passive 162 f.
Misplacement of article 84
Misuse of old literary words 26
Mixed declension 49
Modern Greek: *καί* in place of hypotaxis 12—used as a criterion against Semitism xviii, 17, 94—study comparatively recent 22, 29—dialects in 23 (see *Pontic* and *Zaconian*)—the written language (see *Atticism* and *καθαρεύουσα*)—use of the modern vernacular in NT study 29 f.—versions of NT 30 (see Index I (*e*), p. 265)—Ionic forms in 38—parti

ciple now indeclinable 60, 225—gender changes 60—the dative obsolete 60, 63—vocative 71—article as a relative 81—redundant personal or demonstrative pronoun 85, 94—relative 94—interrogative 94, 95—cardinals as ordinals 96—indefinite article 96—distributives 97—supports Purdie's thesis on the constative 115—present tense for our perfect, with words of duration 119—historic present alternating with aorist 121, 139—pres. and aor. subj. in prohibition 122—imper. in prohibition 122, 164—imperf. and aor. compared 128 f.—idiom of *ἐξέστη* 134—gnomic aorist 135—the perfect obsolete 141 f.—use of Middle 156, 157—new active verbs 162—subj. for relics of *ἄν* 167—negatives 169, 170, 232—auxiliaries forming imperative 175 f., 178, and future 179, 185—sole survival of optative 194, of learned origin 240—infinitive obsolete, except in Pontic (*q.v.*) 205—early date of its characteristics illustrated 233 f.—periphrastic future 234, 240—the parenthetic nominative 235—see Index I (*e*), p. 265, and II, p. 269

Modus irrealis 164, 199–201

Moeris 46, 55

Month, numerals for days of 96

Moods: common subjective element 164—other common ground 165—*ἄν* in connexion with 165–169—negatives (*q.v.*) 169–171 *al*—see under *Imperative*, *Injunctive*, *Optative*, *Subjunctive*, and *Modus irrealis*

Mystical *ἐν* of Paul 68, 103

Narrative, tenses in 135

Nasal in word-endings 45, 49

Negative adjective c. gen. 74, 235

Negatives: in Atticists 25—in NT and papyri 39, 169–171, 177, 184, 185, 187–194, 200, 229, 231 f., 239, 240

Neuter plurals 57 f.

"Neutral" text—see *β-text*

New Testament, how far its diction peculiar 19 f., 67 f.

Nominative: as receiver of unappropriated uses 69—name-case unassimilated 69, 235—*nominativus pendens* 69, 225—parenthetic in time expressions and *εἰκόνες* 70, 235—articular in address 70 f., 235—replaced as predicate by *εἰς* c. acc. 71 f.—personal pronouns not always emphatic 85 f.—for accus. as subject to infin. 212 f.

Nonthematic present stems 38, 55

North-West Greek 33, 36 f., 55

Nouns: in *-ρᾰ* and *-υῖα* 38, 48—heteroclisis 48, 60—contracted 48—in *-οὺς* passing into 3rd decl. 48—in *-ις*, *-ιν*, from *-ιος* and *-ιον* 48 f.—mixed declension 49—accusatives with added *-ν* 49—number 57–59—gender 59 f.—breach of concord 59 f.—case 60–76, 234–236

Number: disappearance of dual 57 f., 77 f.—neuter plural, history and syntax of 57 f.—"Pindaric" construction 58, 234—impersonal plural 58 f., 163—*ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ* 86 f., 246

Numerals: *εἷς* as an ordinal 95 f., 237—ordinals in MGr 96—simplified "teens" 96—*εἷς* as indefinite article 96 f.—*ὁ εἷς* 97—repeated to form distributives 97—*ὄγδοον Νῶε* in AV 97 f.—*ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά* 98

Object clauses 210–213

Objective Genitive 72, 236

Ὁμιλουμένη 26

Omission of *ἄν* 194, 198, 200 f.

Optative: in Lucian 25—*δῴη* 55, 193 f.—future 151, 197—origin 164 f.—with *ἄν* 166, 198—after *πρίν* 169, 199—in command 179—in LXX 194—compared with subj., and with future 194—optative proper 194–197—compared with English survivals 195—in hypothesis 196—differentia of optative conditional sentences 196, 198, 199—in final clauses 196 f.—Atticisers ignorant of sequence 197—misuses in Byzantine Greek 197—potential optative 197–199—attended by *οὐ* and *ἄν* 197—a literary use, but not yet artificial 197—omission of *ἄν* 198—in indirect questions, contrasted with Latin 198 f.—Luke observes sequence 199—itacism in late period hastens decay 199, 239, 240

Oratio obliqua 142, 144, 151, 196, 223, 239

Ordinals: use of *εἷς* 95 f., 237—simplified "teens" 96

Origen 139, 169, 247

Orthography: Attic basis 34—a test of *provenance* of MSS 41—correspondence of NT and papyri 42–56

Over-use of vernacular locutions agreeing with Semitic 11, 14, 21, 39, 61, 72, 74, 95, 99, 215, 226, 235, 242

Oxyrhynchus *Logia* 3, 51, 121, 130, 191 f.—MS of Heb 190, 224

Pagan phraseology 84, 102

Papyri: non-literary, their importance brought out by Deissmann 3 f.—education of writers 4 *al* (see *Edu-*

cation and *Illiteracy*)—compared with inscriptions 6, 28—remarkable anticipation by Brunet de Presle 6 f.—their character and use 27 f.—exceptions to their general agreement with NT 39, 46, 53—see Index I (*d*), pp. 252–255

Parataxis 12, 178, 185, 193

Parenthetic nom. in time-expressions 69, 235, 245—in descriptions 69

Participle: pleonastic by Semitism 14, 230, 241—negatives with 25, 229, 231 f., 239—tendency towards indecl. 60—in gen. abs. 74—translating Hebrew inf. abs. 76—present with article 126 f., 228—aorist of coincident or identical action 130–134, 238—that of subsequent action denied 132–134—with *ἄν* 167—for imperative 180–183, 223, 240—for optative 182—overdone by Josephus 189—for indic. 222–225, 241—in periphrastic tenses 226 f.—complementary 228 f.—contrasted with partic. in Latin and English 229—conditional 229 f.—conjunctive, concessive, causal, final, temporal, and attendant circumstances 230—alleged Aramaism 231

Partitive Genitive: largely replaced by *ἀπό* or *ἐκ* c. abl. 72, 102—possibly with *ὀψέ* 72—as subject of a sentence 73, 223

Passive: no separate forms in Indo-Germanic 108, 152, 156—invades middle in Greek, Latin and elsewhere 153—evolved from intransitive 156—only partially differentiated in aorist and future 161 f.—common ground with middle 162 f.—replaced largely in Aramaic by impersonal plural 163—not definitely attached to the verbal adjective 221 f.

Past time 108, 119, 128, 129

Paul: spoke Greek 7, 19, Latin? 21, 233, Aramaic 7, 10—limited literary phraseology 20—his *ἐν Χριστῷ* 68, 103—use of *we* for *I* 86 f.—use of *between* 99—prohibitions 124–126—perfect 145, 238—middle 160—iterative *ἄν* 167, 168—prefers present imperative 174—imperatival participle 181—*οὐ μή* 190—optative 195—acc. et inf.—211—*τοῦ* c. inf. 217—*πρὸς τό* and *εἰς τό* c. inf. 218 f.—periphrastic tenses 226, 227—*οὐ* c. partic. 232—*ἐλάχιστος* and *ἐλαχιστότερος* 236—compound verbs 237—*μή* in questions 239—*μήτιγε* 240

Perfect: action 109, 111—in English, its double force 136

Perfect: for event on permanent record 129, 142, 143 f.—vivid use for event yet future 134—compared with aorist 140 f.—increasing use in vernacular 141—may be used with a point of time 141, 146—decayed in mediæval Greek 141 f.—obsolete in MGr 141 f.—Latin not responsible 142—characteristic use in Heb 142, 143 f.—combined with aorist 142 f., 238—genuinely aoristic uses possible in Rev 143, 145—broken continuity 144, 145—*ἔσχηκα* 145, 238—*πέπρακα* 145—*γέγονα* 145 f., 239—with present meaning 147, 176, 238—*κέκραγα* 147—*ἥγημαι* literary in Ac 148—strong perfect normally intransitive 154—originally voiceless 154—imperative 176—periphrastic forms 176, 226, 227

Perfective verbs 111–118, 128, 135, 176, 237, 247

Pergamum 29, 38

Periphrasis 226 f., 249—see under *Participle*, and the several tenses

Person-endings 51–54, 152, 154

Personal Pronouns: alleged Semitism 84 f., 94 f.—emphasis in nominative 85 f.—*ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ* 86 f.

Perspective, action in—see *Constative*

Philo 2, 96—see Index I (*e*), p. 264

Phrygian Greek 56—see Index I (*c*), p. 259

Phrynichus 39, 194

Pictorial imperfect 128

Pindar 214—see Index I (*e*), p. 263

Pindaric construction 58, 234

Place, genitive of 73

Plato 62, 213, 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263

Pleonasm 14–16, 85, 94 f., 230, 237, 241

Pluperfect: endings 53—action 113, 148—in conditional sentences, 201

Plural—see *Number*

Plutarch: optative 197—*ὅτι μή* 239—see Index I (*e*), p. 264

Polybius 14, 21, 23, 25, 30, 39, 62, 85, 92, 115–118, 197, 206 f., 247—see Index I (*e*), p. 264.

Pontic dialect of MGr 40, 45, 47, 94, 180, 205

Point action—see *Punctiliar*

Popular etymology 96

Position of article 83 f.

Potential 165, 197–199

Prayer: the Lord's 10, 173—absence of *ὦ* in 71—Jn 17, use of aorist in 137—aorist imper. appropriate to 173—optative in 195

Predicate, with *εἰς* 71

Prepositional clause, anarthrous and articular, 81 f., 236

Prepositions: added to local cases in

Greek 61—extended use in Hellenistic, not due to Semitism 61 f.—statistics for classical and post-classical historians 62 f., and for NT 62 f., 98—in composition with verbs 65, 111–118, 128, 237—replacing partitive gen. 72—"Hebraic" phrases 81 f.—dropping of article between prep. and infin. 81, 216—tendency to drop article after 82, 236—combinations with adverbs 99—Semitism 99 f.—with one case 100–104—alleged Latinisms 100–102—over-use paving the way for extinction 103 f.—with two cases 104–106—statistics 105—with three cases 106 f.—adverbs in essence 112—dropped when compound is repeated soon after 115—compounds tend to be used instead of punctiliar simplex 115–118—Polybius using compounds to avoid hiatus 117—NT writers use them less than the *littérateurs* 118—with articular infinitive 216, 218–220, 241—see Index II under the several Prepositions
Present stem: twenty-three Greek varieties of 109—its linear action 109, 110, 111, 114, 117, 119, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 147, 149, 173, 174, 175, 180, 183, 186—iterative action 109, 114, 119, 125, 127, 128, 129, 173, 180, 186, 233—verbs defective in 110 f.—in perfectivised verbs 113 f.—punctiliar action 119 f., 238—contrasted with aorist in prohibitions 122–126—conative action 125, 127, 128 f., 147, 173 f., 186—timeless articular participle 126 f.—statistics with ἄν 166—imperative, compared with aorist 173 f., 238—quasi-ingressive in ἀποχωρεῖτε 174—subjunctive in warning clauses 178—subjunctive with compounds of ἄν, compared with aorist 186—participle in periphrasis 227—special uses of ὁ ὤν 228—see *Imperfect* and *Present tense*
Present tense: for future time 114, 120, 167—with πάλαι, etc., rendered by our perfect 119—for past time (historic present) 120–122, 139—see *Present stem*
Prohibition: distinction of present and aorist in 122–126—not originally expressed by imperative, nor now in MGr 164—use of injunctive 165—negative in 169, 187 f., 192—in same category as commands 173—οὐ μή 187 f.—must be treated here with denial 187 f.
Pronouns: possessive 40—duality 77, 79 f.—personal 84–87—reflexives 87—unemphatic ἑαυτοῦ and ἴδιος 87–90, 237—ὁ ἴδιος 90 f.—αὐτός ὁ and ὁ αὐτός 91—relatives 91–95—interrogatives 93 f., 95
Pronunciation 28, 33–36, 240, 243, 244—see *Itacism*
Proper names and Article 83, 236
Prophecy, use of *shall* in 150 f.
Protagoras 172
Psilosis 33, 38, 44
Punctiliar action 109–111, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 126, 129–131, 135, 145, 149, 173, 174, 186, 222, 247
Purist school of NT grammarians 3, 242
Purists in MGr 26, 30, 243—cf *Atticism*
Purpose—see *Final clauses*

"Q"—see *Logia*
Qualitative use of anarthrous noun 82 f.
Quantity, levelling of 34
Questions: with μήτι 170—with οὐ 170, 177—with μή 170, 192 f., 239—indirect, in optative 196
Quotations from classical Greek 45, 81, 156, 233, 238 f.
Quotations from OT 11, 16, 52, 124, 174, 188, 190, 192, 224, 235—see Index I (*b*), p. 257

Reciprocal Middle 157
Reciprocal Pronoun, ἑαυτούς used for 87
Reduplication 109, 142, 145
Reference, dative of 63, 75
Reflexive Middle 155–157, 163
Reflexives: no distinction for persons in plural 87—this confusion illiterate in singular 87—used for ἀλλήλους 87—replaced by Semitic use of ψυχή 87—unemphatic ἑαυτοῦ 87–90
Relative time 148
Relatives: pleonastic demonstrative with 85, 94 f., 237—ὅστις 91–93—attraction 92 f.—confused with interrogatives 93 f.—with ἄν (ἐάν) 166, 234—relative sentences, μή in 171, 239—relative clauses replaced by articular participle 228
Religion: technical language 18—conservative phraseology 20
Repetition, making distributives and elatives 97
Reported speech—see *Oratio obliqua*
Result clauses—see *Consecutive*
Resurrection, voice of the verbs applied to 163
Revelation—see *Apocalypse*
Revised Version of NT: quoted or discussed 20, 50, 69, 72, 75, 90, 91,

116, 117, 128, 129, 132, 136–140, 148, 163, 175, 184, 189, 225, 229, 231, 241 — margin 65, 66, 75, 78, 98, 137, 148, 163, 221, 222—the First Revision 83, 156, 180

Rhetoric, rules for command in 172

Rome, Greek used at 5, 242

Sahidic 80

Sanskrit: survival of Indo-Germanic cases 61—locative of indirect object 104—aorist of "thing just happened" 135—future in *-syāmi* 149—grammarians' names for active and middle 153—2 sing. mid. secondary suffix *-thās* compared with Greek weak aorist passive 161—survival of the injunctive 165—imperative suffix *-tāt* 172—Vedic subjunctive makes in Epic a 1st person imperative 175—Vedic infinitives 203—classical ditto 204—infinitive parallel with *sequimini* 224—parenthetic nominative in time-expression 235—active and middle forms differentiated by *Ablaut* 238

Scotch parallel to ἄν 166, 239

Second Epistle of Peter 78, 98, 171, 238 f.

Semitism—see *Aramaic* and *Hebraism*

Septuagint: "translation Greek" of 2 f., 13—Justin Martyr's dependence on 8, 233—εἰς ἀπάντησιν in 14—constructions of ἐγένετο=וַיְהִי 16 f.—extent of Luke's imitation 18—Hebraisms from this source to be carefully distinguished from Aramaisms 18—3rd pl. in -σαν 33, 56—indecl. πλήρης 50—gender of Βάαλ 59—αὕτη for זאת 59—πιστεύειν 67 f.—parenthetic nominative 70—violent use of gen. abs. 74—renderings of the Hebrew infin. abs. 75 f.—"exhausted" ἴδιος and ἑαυτοῦ 88—redundant demonstrative after relative 95, 237—"77 times" 98, 107—uses of ἐν 103—περί c. dat. 105—πρός c. dat. and gen. 106—πρῶτος 107—historic pres. 121—ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 131—semi-aoristic perfect 142—aorist and perfect together 143—κέκραγα and κράζω 147—κοιμᾶν active 162—ἀποκεκομμένος 163—statistics for ἄν 166—perf. imper. 176—subj. used for future 185—οὐ μή 188, 191 f.—δῴη optative 194—εἰ c. opt. 196—optative disappearing in final clauses 197—potential opt. 197 f.—ὄφελον 201—articular infin. 220, 241—participle for indicative 224—partic. c. εἰμί, disproving Aramaism 226—לֹא c. partic. translated with οὐ 232—ἐάν for ἄν 234—articular nom. in address 235—μία for πρώτη 237—statistics for infin. 241—Mk little influenced by 242—see under *Quotations*, and Index I (*b*), p. 250

Sequence, rules of: Luke observes with πρίν 169, 199—breach of 197—in indirect question 199

Sermon on the Mount, respective proportions of aorist and present imper. in Mt and Lk 174

Sextus Empiricus 52

Shall and *Will* 150 f.

Simple conditions 171

Sinaiticus, Codex 34, 35, 38, 42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 55, 65, 90, 133, 181, 190 *al*

Slavonic: perfective compounds 111—future from that in *-syō* (obsolete) 149—cf *Lithuanian*

Sophocles 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263

Sources for study of Κοινή 22 f., 27–30

Sparta 24, 32

Spoken Greek—see *Vernacular*

Style, in Luke and Heb (*q.v.*) 18

Subjective genitive 72, 236—moods 164—negative 169 f.

Subjunctive: itacistic confusions with indicative 35—forms in contract verbs 54—δωη 55, 193 f., 196—origin 164—relation to injunctive 165—after compounds of ἄν 166, 186, 239, 240—after πρὶν (ἢ) ἄν 169—after εἰ μήτι ἄν 169, 239—negatives 170, 184 f., 187 f., 190, 192—1st person volitive used to supplement imperative 175, 177—ditto in 2nd and 3rd person 177 f.—volitive in positive commands 177 f.—c. ἵνα as an imperative 177 f.—its tone in command 178—with μή in warning 178, 184—present allowed here 178—classified 184—volitive 184 f.—deliberative 184, 185—futuristic 184, 185, 186, 192, 240—future indic. trespasses on all three 184 f., 240—volitive clauses of purpose 185 (see *Final*)—futuristic with ἐάν and ὅταν (*q.v.* in Index II), etc. 185—in comparisons 185 f.—tenses of 186—with εἰ 187, 239—has excluded optative from final clauses 196 f.—c. ἵνα has become equivalent of infin. 205 (see ἵνα in Index II)

Subsequent action, alleged aor. partic. of 132–134

Suffixes—see severally in Index II

Superfluous words—see *Pleonasm*

Superlative 78 f., 236

Syncretism of cases 61, 72, 104—of tenses in English 135

Synoptic question, grammatical points in 15–18, 71, 95, 103, 104, 105, 124,

174, 175, 189–192, 224, 226 f., 231, 236, 241, 242—see under *Matthew, Mark, Luke*
Syntax: alleged Semitisms in 12 f.—Latinisms 21
Syriac 104, 241, 244—see *Lewis*, and cf *Aramaic*
Syrian Recension 42, 53—see *a-text*

Teleology 219
Telic—see *Final clauses*
Temporal Participle 230
Tenses: connexion with time unoriginal 108 f., 119—with ἄν 166, 186—in conditional sentences 166, 201—in infinitive 204—in verbal adjective 221—see under the several Tenses
Tertullian 69
Textual Criticism: pronunciation bearing on 34–36—*a*, *β* and *δ* text (*q.v.*)—see also under *Alexandrinus, Bezae, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus*, etc.
"Textus Receptus"—see *a-text*
Thematic vowel 171
Thucydides 25, 62, 215, 216—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
Time: cases expressing 63, 70, 72, 73, 75—connexion with tense unoriginal 108 f., 119—expressed by augment, and possibly by suffix *-i* 128—the perfect accompanied by mark of 141
Timelessness: participles 126 f., 134—perfect and aorist 134
Traditional spelling 35 f.
"Translation Greek" 4, 13, 39, 59, 76, 102, 104, 105, 106, 188 f., 237, 240, 242, 248—see *Hebraism* and *Aramaic*
Translations of NT: Latin, Syriac, Sahidic, Bohairic, Gothic (*q.v.*)—Hebrew (Delitzsch) 104, 163—MGr (Pallis and B.F.B.S.) 22, 30—see Index I (*e*), p. 265

Uncontracted vowels 38, 48, 54 f., 234
Unemphatic pronouns 85—*ἑαυτοῦ* and *ἴδιος* 87–90
Unfulfilled condition 171, 196, 199–201—wish 200—purpose 201
Unification of Greek dialects 30
Uniformity of Κοινή 5 f., 19, 38–41
Universal language, Greek as a 5 f., 19, 28 f., 31

Vase-inscriptions, Attic 31, 33
Vaticanus, Codex 34, 35, 38, 42, 47, 52, 53, 54, 80, 90, 97, 131, 133, 159, 169, 181, 190, 244 *al*—see *β-text*
Verba dicendi et cogitandi 239
Verbal adjectives 221 f.
Verbs: forms 38, 51–56—in *μι* (see *Nonthematic*)—number 58 f.—transitive and intransitive 64, 65 (*q.v.*)—cases governed by 64–68—*Aktionsart* 108–118, 221 *al* (see *Action-form*)—defectives 110 f.—compounds (*q.v.*)—tenses 119–151 (see under the several tenses)—voice (*q.v.*) 152–163—moods (*q.v.*) 164–201—infinitive and participle (*q.v.*) 202–232
Vernacular Greek 1, 4 f., 22–41, 83, 85, 188, 234, 239 *al*
Vocative: not strictly a case 60—relations with articular nominative of address 70 f., 235—few forms surviving 71—anarthrous nominative tends to supplant it 71—progressive omission of ὦ 71—like imperative, is an interjection 171
Voice 152–163, 221, 238 f.—see *Middle Passive, Active*
Volitive future 150, 151, 177—subjunctive 175, 177 f., 184 f.—see under *Future* and *Subjunctive*
Vulgate—see *Latin*

Wales, bilingualism in 7 f., 10 f.
"We"-document 217—see *Acts*
Week, days of 96, 237
"Western" Text—see *δ-text*
Wish: optative in 195—unrealised 200 f.—ditto in future with ὄφελον 201
World-language—see *Universal*
Wulfila—see *Gothic*

Xenophon: fore-runner of Hellenism 31—grammar of 62—see Index I (*e*)
Xenophon, pseudo- 25—see Index I (*e*)

Zaconian, 32, 249
Zeugma 241

ADDENDA TO INDICES

INDEX I.

(*a*) NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW

PAGE
5. 17, 19 . . . 115
5. 24 . . . 247
5. 25 . . . 249
5. 26 . . . 188
6. 2, 5, 16 . . . 247
7. 29 . . . 227
10. 11 . . . 249
11. 12 . . . 163
11. 25 . . . 52
12. 18 . . . 64
17. 14 . . . 69
18. 7 . . . 246
18. 22 . . . 107
27. 29 . . . 246

MARK

1. 34 . . . 69
1. 41 f. . . . 56
11. 2 . . . 129
13. 20 . . . 246
13. 21 . . . 125

LUKE

4. 29 . . . 249
9. 58 . . . 185
15. 13 . . . 130
16. 16 . . . 163
19. 37 . . . 244

JOHN

3. 16 . . . 249
4. 52 . . . 248
4. 52 f. . . . 245
5. [4] . . . 245
6. 15 . . . 107
10. 32 . . . 247
15. 13 . . . 249
17. 21, 24 f. . . . 245
18. 11 . . . 189

ACTS

PAGE
7. 34 . . . 185
10. 30 . . . 245
17. 27 . . . 56
17. 31 . . . 107
19. 2 . . . 131
19. 27, 37 . . . 60, 244
26. 7 . . . 205

ROMANS

2. 9 f. . . . 115
5. 2 . . . 248
14. 5 . . . 246

1 CORINTHIANS

3. 14 f. . . . 185
4. 21 . . . xvii
7. 21 . . . 247
7. 28 . . . 247
7. 29 . . . 179
10. 9 . . . 115

2 CORINTHIANS

11. 3 . . . 248
12. 1 . . . 248

GALATIANS

2. 10 . . . 95
2. 14 . . . 244
2. 16 . . . 241
3. 18 . . . 248
3. 21 . . . 67
4. 23 . . . 248
5. 2 . . . 162
5. 4 . . . 247
5. 17 . . . 249
6. 10 . . . 248
6. 12 . . . 247

EPHESIANS

5. 5 . . . 245, 246

PHILIPPIANS

PAGE
1. 24 f. . . . 115

COLOSSIANS

1. 21 . . . 227
2. 18 . . . 239
3. 9 . . . 117

1 THESSALONIANS

2. 11 . . . 225
2. 16 . . . 249
5. 4 . . . 249
5. 11 . . . 246

1 TIMOTHY

5. 22 . . . 125

2 TIMOTHY

4. 7 . . . 237

HEBREWS

3. 18 . . . 205
7. 7 . . . 246
11. 17 . . . 247
12. 17 . . . 245

JAMES

1. 19 . . . 245
5. 12 . . . 126

1 PETER

1. 11 . . . 246
3. 1 . . . 90

2 PETER

1. 16 . . . 231

(*b*) OLD TESTAMENT.

PAGE
Gen. 3. 20 . . 235
,, 38. 25 . . 93
Num. 21. 14 . 235
1 Sam. (1 K.) 20. 3 245
2 Sam. (2 K.) 19. 28 13
Job 21. 24 . . 50
Isai. 7. 2 . . 185
,, 17. 11 . . 185
Isai. 31. 4. . . 185
,, 37. 38 . . 244
,, 63. 2 . . 50
Jer. 42 (49). 22 . 245

APOCRYPHA.

Wis. 7. 14 . . 245
Wis. 12. 2 . . 67
Esth. 14. 17 (C. 28) 13

(*c*) INSCRIPTIONS.

Syll.
Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, iterum ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1898, 1900, 1901).
no. 356. . . 167
364. . . 64
376. . . 121
385. . . 107
537. . . 240
538. . . 240
no. 540. . . 240
549. . . 240
578. . . 46
653. 46, 80, 101, 214, 245
656. . . 121
no. 734. . . 76
737. . . 55
807. . 14, 144
850. . . 107
928. . . 227
930. . . 81

JHS xxii. 358. . . . 244
BCH xxiv. 339 . . . 244

(*d*) PAPYRI AND OSTRAKA.

BM
Vol. iii. (1907—cited by pages).
p. 1 . . . 76
105 . . . 76
p. 131 . . . 249
p. 136 . . 53, 228

BU
Vol. i.
no. 5 . . . 240
no. 11 . . . 240
no. 180 . . 101
Vol. ii.
530 . . . 240
Vol. iii.
798 . . . 246

Par P
no. 43 . . . 86
no. 47 . . . 200
no. 58 . . . 55

PP
Vol. iii.
no. 28 . . . 107
43 . . . 234
no. 56 . . . 46
no. 65 . . . 46

OP
Vol. iii.
no. 466. . . 244
Vol. iv.
no. 743. . . 194

Tb P
Vol. i.
no. 16 . . xvii, 246
no. 61 . . . 244
Vol. ii. (1907—nos. 265–689)
no. 283. . . 249
309. . . 228
314. . . 76
315. . . 76
no. 333. . 168, 193
357. . . 97
391. . . 239
408. . . 178
no. 412. . . 159
413. . . 237
414. . 177, 178
526. . . 240

Hb P

Hibeh Papyri, vol. i. (ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1906—all iii/B.C.).

PAGE
no. 30 . . . 99
41 . . . 176
42 . . . 76
44 . . . 246
45 . 129, 177, 247

PAGE
no. 51 . . . 234
56 . . . 123
59 . . . 185
60 . . . 177

PAGE
no. 77 . . . 244
78 . . . 168
96 . . . 234
168. . . 177

EP

Elephantine Papyri, ed. O. Rubensohn (Berlin, 1907—all iv or iii/B.C.).

no. 11 . . . 144 | no. 13 . . . 86

Ll P

Papyrus grecs, from the *Institut Papyrologique de Université de Lille* ; ed. P. Jouguet (tome i. fasc. 1, 2, Paris, 1907–8).

no. 1 . . 130, 178

Lp P

Griech. Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig, ed. L. Mitteis, vol. i. (Leipzig, 1906).

no. 41 . . 150, 159

Rein P

Papyrus Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

no. 7 . . . 200

Str P

Strassburg Papyri, ed. Fr. Preisigke. vol. i. part 1, 1906.

no. 22 . . . 76

Ostr

Griechische Ostraka, by Ulrich Wilcken. 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1899.)

nos. 1–900 . 243 f., 246 | no. 240. . . 245 | no. 927. . . 245

Mélanges Nicole

Studies, largely papyrological, in honour of Prof. Jules Nicole, Geneva, 1905.

p. 184 . . . 244 | p. 185 . . . 244 | p. 281 . . . 246

INDEX III.

Aorist: action-form, 247—expressing *immediate* past 247—compared with perfect 247 f.
Aramaic: in Egypt xvi f., 242—infin. for imper. 248
Attic: treatment of ᾱ 244

Bezae, Codex 56, 244, 249
Bilingualism 243

Compound verbs, not confined to literary Greek 237

Dative: *ethicus* 76—*commodi* 76—illiterate use of gen. for, 245

Education, varieties of 244
"Exhausted" ἴδιος 246

Final clauses: weakened ἵνα 249

Genitive: with ἀκούειν and γεύεσθαι 245—partitive 245—εἰς supplying for possessive 246

Hebraism: ἕως πότε 107—βλέπειν ἀπό 107—ἴστε γινώσκοντες 245—use of πᾶς with negative 245 f.

Imperfect 248
Infinitive: for imperative 248—purpose (anarthrous) 249—relations with ἵνα 248—in MGr 249

John : use of *ἵνα* 206, 249

Καθαρεύουσα 243, 245, 246
Κοινή : periods in 41, 45, 48—history of name 243

A, Codex 234
Lexical notes : *εἰς ἀπάντησιν* 242
Literary element in NT 245
Luke : accurate use of *ἡ θεός* 60, 244

Middle : "incorrect" uses 248
Modern Greek : versions of NT 243—*πᾶσα* 244—*ἀπό* 245—*τις* 246—survivals 249

Ostraka 243 ff., 283

Partitive gen., replaced by *ἀπό* 245
Paul : literary use of *ἴστε* ? 245—use of perfect 248—Hebraism in ? 245
Perfect : in reff. to Scripture, in Paul 248 combined with aor.—*ἔσχηκα*—248
Plautus 202
Prepositions, replacing partitive 245
Present stem : punctiliar 247—imperative compared with aorist 247
Pronunciation of *η*, *ῃ*, *ει* 41

Revised Version 245

Septuagint : flexion of *-ρᾰ* nouns, etc. 48—acc. in *-αν* in 3rd decl. 49—*ἐκαθερίσθη* 56—*οὐθείς* and *οὐδείς* 56—3 pl. opt. in *-σαν* 56—uses of *ἐν* 245
Subjunctive, futuristic 249
Symmachus 245

Textual Criticism : pronunciation bearing on 244—relations of B and D 244, 249
Time, cases expressing 245
Tobit, uses of *ἐν* 245

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, *Edinburgh*